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ABSTRACT

This dissertation analyzes a series of Anarchist crimes, occurring in England from 1892-1911, and concentrates on the public dialogue that emerged in the popular press as a result of these crimes. British newspapers and periodicals published extensively on the crimes, and the crimes became a way for the British public to discuss wide-ranging topics, such as liberalism, labor, immigration, poverty and national degeneration. Many Britons believed that these crimes had revealed an Anarchist danger hidden within England, and, as a result, many Englanders perceived Britain’s social and political customs to be outdated and unsafe. These crimes occurred at a time when popular mass media both informed and reflected British public opinion; thus, the primary sources used in this work were British newspapers, serials, journal articles and novels, as well as Government documents and parliamentary debates.

This dissertation argues that the public debates stemming from these Anarchist crimes altered the self-conception of Britain’s political culture. Anarchists became equated with violence, and any affiliation between Anarchism and politics was lost. Instead, Anarchists were seen as diseased and abnormal individuals who bombed and assassinated because of their depraved natures rather than political gain. Widespread fear of Anarchists dominated British political, social and economic debates, and Britain’s numerous pre-existing fears at the turn of the century became embodied by Anarchism. Immigration became the importation of Anarchists into England; the plight the urban poor became the creation of Anarchists, and the State’s inability to control Anarchists became proof that the British nation was crumbling. The political debates generated by the fear of Anarchism led to a reconceptualization of the British State and
its relationship to the individual and the social body. For many Britons, the role of Government fundamentally changed due to the public’s dialogue on Anarchism in Edwardian England. While Edwardian England is generally considered a divisive period of decay and destruction, this dissertation will contend that Edwardian England was also a time of unity and solidarity as the English public united against the common enemy of Anarchism and laid the foundation for England’s postwar, interventionist State.
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I.

INTRODUCTION

“The ignorant mass looks upon the man who makes a violent protest against our social and economic iniquities as upon a wild beast, a cruel, heartless monster, whose joy it is to destroy life and bathe in blood; or at best, as upon an irresponsible lunatic.”


In early January 1911, a British citizen, a self-proclaimed “ordinary man,” tried to make sense of a heavily publicized spectacle of Anarchist violence that had recently occurred in the East End of London. In the *Daily Mail*, he wrote, “The war is over. We have...concentrated the resources of the nation on the emergency...We mobilized our Secretary of State, several commissioners and assistant-commissioners, regiments of police (horse and foot), hordes of detectives, the peace establishment of a Guards battalion, a powerful artillery contingent, and the fire brigade.” The “ordinary man” boasted, “after a hard day’s fighting we have exterminated two undesirable aliens.”

The “ordinary man” pointed his readers to a more comprehensible and familiar threat than the recent surge of Anarchist violence – the notorious rats of London’s streets and sewers.¹ The

¹ Rats had become such a problem by the turn of the twentieth century that various London authorities launched a full-scale “Rat War” in 1903 to stem their tide. For one contemporary account, see *Lloyd’s Weekly News*, 12 February 1911. The effort was substantial enough to attract the attention of the foreign press. See, for example, *The New York Times*, 28 December 1903. Also, James Rodwell’s book, *The Rat: It’s History and Destructive Character*, 1858. The public debates that emerged concerning the spread of rats centered on the many “evils” posed by their presence. Sir James Crichton-Browne, famed psychiatrist and one of London’s most respected public health experts,
“ordinary man” viewed the rats and the Anarchists as analogous threats – both were “plague-spreading vermin” who lurked within British cities and preyed upon respectable western society. Rats and Anarchists were the opposite of proper Britons, whom “the ordinary man” defined as, “respectable, industrious, law-abiding, useful, food producing creatures...” Like the rats, Anarchists were inherently dangerous to society and required extermination, without mercy or “civilised methods.” Thus, for the “ordinary man,” the nature of the Anarchist threat in England justified the force used against two Anarchists in the East End:

Given the two armed criminals at war with society, I am ready to concede all the rest as reasonable and necessary – the troops, the barricades, the police with shot-guns and revolvers, the Home Secretary with his secretary and his secretary’s secretary, the firemen, the Maxim, the half-battery of Royal Horse Artillery, and even the dirigible. All this concentration of force had its uses when two foreign Anarchist bush-rangers had entrenched themselves in the heart of our civilisation.2

Out of the chaos in the East End, the “ordinary man” found a message of warning – Britain faced a war at home against Anarchists, the enemies of civilization.3

---

2 Daily Mail, 5 January 1911.
3 The terms civilization, humanity, barbarism, and evil were commonly used phrases at the turn of the century in Britain. These phrases were typically used to identify and differentiate the group the speaker claimed to represent against the dangerous people or ideas being discussed. For further discussion, see Enemies of Humanity: The Nineteenth-Century War on Terror, Ed. By Isaac Land, 2008, and Evil, Barbarism, and Empire: Britain and Abroad, c.1830-2000, Ed. By Tom Crook, Rebecca Gill, and Bertrand Taithe, 2011.

claimed the rat was a dangerous invader whose small benefit was not worth its dangers and should be eradicated as soon as possible for the public good. Like many of his generation, he considered rats a danger to civilization by their very nature, and he felt they could only be adequately dealt with in uncivilized ways. See “The Rat War” in The Spectator, March 1908.
A. HISTORICAL CONTEXT

i. ENGLAND IN THE FIN-DE-SIÈCLE

The “ordinary man’s” account revealed several key aspects of the public and political culture of late-Victorian and Edwardian England. First, the fin-de-siècle was rife with change and tension, and the British populace struggled to make sense of rapidly shifting social, political, and economic conditions. Anarchists, such as the two men mentioned above, or at least the popular image of Anarchists, often served as crucial ciphers in understanding the broader conflicts that characterized the turn of the century in British history and often informed a wide range of decisions concerning British private and public life.

By 1911, the Anarchist had become a popular, pan-European motif of violence, insanity, and destruction. In Britain, however, fears of violent Anarchism coalesced in the context of a more general transition from the optimism of the mid-Victorian period to the gloom and anxiety of the fin-de-siècle. The British Empire was becoming more interconnected at the turn of the century, and the rise of the popular press, which dramatically grew in the 1880’s, engaged an increasingly large and diverse audience in a range of political and social issues.

---


5 I am not meaning this in the Habermasian sense of the “public sphere” where individuals can freely access and contribute to political dialogues, but rather that a growing number of people, including the many working-class males who had gained the right to vote in the Reform Acts of the 1860’s and 1880’s, were influenced by the wider reach of political discussions, and increasingly shared a base of social knowledge. For example, the Jack the Ripper murders in the late 1880’s, through the popular press, became an iconic trope well outside of London’s East End, and political dialogue on the case reached a particularly wide audience because of the prevalence of newspaper accounts, crime novels, pamphlets, magazine stories, and cartoons on the case. See Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry Into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, 1989. For an updated version of Habermas that moves his ideas forward into the age of the modern mass press, see Michael Warner, *Publics and Counter Publics*, 2002. For a case study that explores the public significance of stereotypes on British
Government became more involved in domestic life, increasing control over education and expanding the police, and the State increased its involvement in Britain’s social problems, such as poverty, moving slowly away from the Gladstonian Liberal emphasis on free trade and personal liberty.

Turn of the century immigration concerns greatly contributed to the unease present in the Edwardian period. British immigration laws in the nineteenth century were traditionally very lax. As Colin Holmes notes, “Britain was widely perceived as a centre of liberal refuge where the persecuted of other lands could take shelter.”\(^6\) Immigration controls imposed in 1793 had been abolished by 1836, leaving immigration largely unregulated up to the turn of the century. However, by the 1880’s new waves of immigrants were flooding into England from Eastern Europe. Many of these new immigrants took up residence in the East End and caused alarm among English citizens. Pressure groups formed in response to the new immigrants, such as the Society for the Suppression of the Immigration of Destitute Aliens (1886), to halt what some deemed to be an unmanageable influx of inferior races and individuals. The antipathy came to a head in 1905 when the Aliens Act of 1905 was passed, targeting so-called “undesirable aliens.”\(^7\) By late 1910, continued immigration from Eastern Europe, together with dissatisfaction at the effectiveness of the Aliens Act of 1905 and its administration by the Liberal party, had elevated immigration to a volatile, high-profile issue. While contemporary statistics on Russian immigration were often wildly exaggerated, the presence of Russian immigrants appeared particularly overwhelming in London, where in 1901 more than 53,000 of the nearly 83,000 Russian immigrants lived, with 80 percent of those concentrated in the borough of Stepney.

---


alone. The cumulative effect, as many historians have argued, was a widespread feeling that Britain was ‘under threat’ from a variety of new and sinister forces: Anarchists, Socialists, ‘degenerate’ members of the underclass, immigrants, Irish Fenian terrorists, and secret foreign agents.

Massive immigration, especially from Eastern Europe, transformed the demography within England, particularly in large urban regions, such as London and Manchester. Areas of London, such as the East End, were changing into neighborhoods inhabited primarily by recent immigrants to the United Kingdom. These urban centers became notorious for poverty and crime, particularly after the 1880’s when social reformers, such as William and Charles Booth and Sidney and Beatrice Webb, published descriptions and statistics that presented the precipitous decline of such areas. These widely-read surveys highlighted the plight of a new stratum of the urban poor, sometimes dubbed the ‘residuum’, steeped in drink and capable only of irregular employment. High publicity crimes, such as the Jack the Ripper murders in the late 1880’s, only confirmed the public perception that boroughs of urban poor were a wasteland of human degeneration.

Many segments of the middle- and upper-classes feared that Socialism might take root among the many poor and disaffected individuals of the urban classes. Many others worried that the deteriorating conditions of urban centers demonstrated the physical degeneracy of the British

---

nation. Britons’ concerns over national degeneracy were supported by the increasingly popular ideas of Social Darwinism and by studies at the turn of the century that indicated a falling birthrate throughout England.

Imperial problems intensified social uncertainties, as the British faced increasing competition to their imperial hegemony after the 1880’s. The rapid unification of Germany in 1870-1871 threatened to destroy the European balance of power, and Germany’s efficient manufacturing threatened England’s industrial strength. The emergence of the United States as a leading importer and exporter of goods further reduced Britain’s economic dominance.

Nationalism, especially prominent among the Boers in South Africa and the Fenians in Ireland, threatened the stability of the Empire from within. Ireland was a particular menace to England during this time, especially after 1876, when the Irish Republican Brotherhood and the Clan-na-Gael organizations united their efforts to campaign for Irish Home Rule and initiated a wave of bombings that rocked Britain in the 1880’s. A general feeling of decline pervaded the British nation, and Englanders perceived such widespread changes as signs that home and Empire were in danger.

In 1906, when the Liberal party returned to power after nearly two decades of Conservative rule, it found itself at the helm of a changing political nation. The Reform Bills of the 1860’s and 1880’s had greatly increased the electorate, giving most British men the right to vote. In response the British Government set up the 1903 Committee on Physical Deterioration to investigate the general health of the population. Although the 1904 report that was put forth by the Committee on Physical Deterioration indicated no long-term physical degeneration in the population, it recommended several safeguards against the perceived declining population, such as medical inspections, free meals in schools, and child-care training for the Nation’s mothers. See G.R. Searle, The Quest for National Efficiency: A Study in British Politics and Political Thought, 1899-1914, 1971; Michael Paris, Warrior Nation: Images of War in British Popular Culture, 1850- 2000, 2000; and Anne Summers, “Militarism in Britain before the Great War” in History Workshop, Autumn 1976.

11 As many as one in three British recruits in the Boer War failed the medical examination, but within some areas that number was as high as nine in ten. In response the British Government set up the 1903 Committee on Physical Deterioration to investigate the general health of the population. Although the 1904 report that was put forth by the Committee on Physical Deterioration indicated no long-term physical degeneration in the population, it recommended several safeguards against the perceived declining population, such as medical inspections, free meals in schools, and child-care training for the Nation’s mothers. See G.R. Searle, The Quest for National Efficiency: A Study in British Politics and Political Thought, 1899-1914, 1971; Michael Paris, Warrior Nation: Images of War in British Popular Culture, 1850- 2000, 2000; and Anne Summers, “Militarism in Britain before the Great War” in History Workshop, Autumn 1976.

vote. Therefore, British politicians were increasingly pressed to cater to public fears and concerns. Labor parties rose in the wake of the reform bills to represent the interests of working-class voters, and new working-class voters became increasingly politically active, resulting in waves of strikes that spread across England. Moreover, these extensions of the electorate had excluded women, and women, who had begun to campaign in earnest for enfranchisement from the 1850’s forward, turned to violence by the first decade of the twentieth century under the direction of Emmeline Pankhurst and her daughter Christabel in the Women’s Social and Political Union. Other radical social groups at the turn of the century, such as the Syndicalists, also took on a more sinister and militant complexion as such groups utilized violence to advocate for political change. The Government attempted to quell the rising number of violent radical groups with police intervention but had very limited success, in large part due to a Parliament in the second half of the nineteenth century that had favored non-intervention. Nationalists in Ireland, who were well supported by Irish M.P.’s in the House of Commons, furthered the sense of political unrest as they threatened the integrity of Ireland’s union with England.

After 1906, the defeated Conservative party attempted to block many of the Liberal Government’s reforms and turned to the conservative bastion in the House of Lords to veto measures passed in the House of Commons. The resulting political feuds and political division deepened the growing sense of unrest within England and increased the public perception that the Government did not follow the will of the British people.

---

13 For example, Gladstone turned to a four day spree of public, open-air speeches to win the Conservative dominated Midlothian district in Scotland in the 1880 election, helping bring the Liberals back into power. See David Brooks, “Gladstone and Midlothian: The Background to the First Campaign” in *The Scottish Historical Review*, April 1985.
In sum, the Edwardian era was pervaded by a deep-seated and generalized sense of anxiety due to the numerous political divisions and social grievances that vexed the British nation at the turn of the century. Immigration, particularly the increased influx of immigrants from Eastern Europe, worried the British public, and many citizens feared the presence of large, poor, primarily immigrant communities. The deplorable living and working conditions found in the urban slums also concerned the British public and increased England’s fear of immigrants and social degeneration. In addition, nationalist concerns plagued Englanders, as many Britons perceived that the might and power of the nation and the Empire were deteriorating. The changing electorate, the increasingly political working-classes, and the emergence of violent radical social groups also altered the turn of the century political climate, and Edwardian politics reflected the overwhelming state of unrest in England.15

ii. THE RISE OF THE ANARCHIST MOVEMENT IN EUROPE

Anarchism had a relatively limited presence in Europe and much less Britain before the 1880’s. As a movement, Anarchism stemmed from the French Revolution and those, such as William Godwin, who embraced the French Revolution’s spirit of rational and educational reform but feared the tyrannical potential of government seen in the Committee for Public Safety and in the rule of Napoleon. Anarchism as an organized body of thought, however, originated with Pierre Proudhon, who first called himself an “an-archist” in 1840 in his political text, What is Property?.16 Proudhon, along with contemporaries Michael Bakunin and Max Stirner,

---
15 The classic historical work on the ‘decline’ of Britain at the turn of the century is George Dangerfield’s The Strange Death of Liberal England, 1935. For a more recent exploration into the psychology and perception of decline at the time, see Stephen Arata, Fictions of Loss in the Victorian Fin-de-Siècle: Identity and Empire, 2006.
16 Pierre Proudhon, What is Property?: An Inquiry Into the Principle of Right and of Government, 1840.

The early followers of Anarchism gained very little momentum until the 1860’s, when a small degree of organization built around Bakunin and culminated with the establishment of Anarchist sections in the International Workingman’s Association, most notably the founding of the Jura Federation based in the Swiss Mountains in 1870. Anarchist groups in Paris were instrumental in March of 1871 in the insurrection and establishment of the autonomous Paris Commune, whose brief self-government reflected many of the federalist and decentralized aims advocated earlier by Proudhon. However, the French State brutally crushed the Commune little more than a month later, and Anarchism, along with other Socialist movements, were subsequently banned in France and forced underground. Anarchists were soon forced out of the International Workingman’s Association after disagreements with Karl Marx and his majority followers, and the sense of organization and momentum among Anarchists greatly declined for nearly a decade.\footnote{For a discussion of the split between Marxists and Anarchists at the First International and the ensuing effects on the Anarchist movement, see G.D.H. Cole, \textit{A History of Socialist Thought. Volume 2. Marxism and Anarchism}, 1954.}

By the late 1870’s Anarchism began a resurgence, particularly through the establishment of revolutionary journals, such as the German \textit{Der Freiheit} and the French \textit{Le Révolté}, which spread the ideals of the movement’s founders as well as those of a new generation of theorists and activists. Bakunin had long dissented from Proudhon’s vision of Anarchism as a relatively
peaceful collectivist movement, and as early as 1842 Bakunin had argued that the existing State and society across Europe were incompatible with real change. In an essay titled “The Reaction in Germany: A Fragment from a Frenchman”, written under the pseudonym Jules Elysard, Bakunin argued that destruction of the existing order had a valuable and essential role to play in making real and permanent change. In his famous line, Bakunin provocatively commended the utility of violence: “The passion for destruction is a creative passion, too!” Bakunin’s line of thought gained popularity in the 1870’s among a small subsection of new Anarchist leaders, no doubt reflecting their frustrations with the movement’s sputtered growth, its fallout from the International Workingman’s Association, and the State repression in France following the fall of the Paris Commune. This group of Anarchists passionately advocated a more confrontational and potentially violent strain of Anarchism that focused on action over merely words – an idea that would become known as ‘propaganda by the deed’. While most Anarchists remained relatively peaceful throughout the turn of the century, the idea of ‘propaganda by the deed’ found widespread sympathy among many Anarchist circles, due in part to persuasive advocates, passionate martyrs, and the promise of fast and dramatic change.

Paul Brousse explained the concept of ‘propaganda by the deed’ to his fellow Anarchists in 1877 in the Bulletin of the Jura Federation. He grappled with the question of why the masses, who he argued were wretchedly abused and exploited by the current political and social institutions, were not listening to the Anarchist message. He argued that the masses were largely illiterate, worked long hours, and had very little money. Therefore, they did not have the

---

19 See Michael Bakunin’s “The Reaction in Germany: A Fragment from a Frenchman” reprinted in Sam Dolgoff, Bakunin on Anarchism, 1980.
inclination, energy, or resources to read Anarchist writings or listen to Anarchist speeches.

‘Propaganda by the deed’ was the answer for Brousse, a way of bringing ideas to life. Making a public demonstration and a dramatic gesture, he claimed, was a way “of grabbing these people’s attention, of showing them what they cannot read, of teaching them socialism by means of actions and making them see, feel, touch.”

Brousse did not intend that this necessarily had to include violence, but others, such as Carlo Cafiero, were more explicit. In an article in *Le Rêvolté* in 1880, Cafiero decreed that ‘propaganda by the deed’ must be carried out “by word, by writing, by dagger, by gun, by dynamite.” Even the enormously influential Peter Kropotkin, who would later disavow the violent strain of Anarchism and become known as ‘the Prince of Peace,’ found himself drawn to violence in the early 1880’s. In his article “Expropriation” from *Le Rêvolté* in 1885, Kropotkin argued that society needed redistribution but that redistribution would require destruction and violent seizure. He wrote,

> But destroy without delay everything that should be overthrown; the penal fortresses and the prisons, the forts directed against towns and the unhealthy quarters where you have so long breathed an air heavy with poison. Install yourselves in the palaces and mansions, and make a bonfire of the piles of bricks and worm-eaten wood that were your hovels. The instinct to destroy, which is so natural and so just because it is also the urge to renew, will find much to satisfy it. So many outworn things to replace!

Practitioners of ‘propaganda by the deed’ acted largely without coordination or instruction, and their attacks often reflected more about the local circumstances and personalities than about the broader Anarchist movement. A small wave of Anarchist attacks struck Russia in the 1870’s, particularly in the form of political assassinations, but they garnered little media attention outside

---

24 Peter Kropotkin, “Expropriation” in *Words of a Rebel*, 1885.
of Russia. This situation changed somewhat in March 1881 when members of the Anarchist organization *Narodnaya Volya* ("People’s Will") assassinated Tsar Alexander II of Russia. The Russian State began a backlash against all Socialists and began to reverse any previous piecemeal efforts towards reform. The international press took notice of the assassination, but reactions tended to focus on the perceived backwards nature of Russia and its political system rather than on Anarchism. The notable exception was the arrest and imprisonment in London of Johann Most, the editor of the German Anarchist periodical *Der Freiheit*, who was arrested and made headlines throughout the Western world when he proclaimed his delight at the death of the Tsar. Anarchist organizations responded to Tsar Alexander II’s assassination with a condemnation of the Tsarist regime and a general support of the Russian revolutionaries, and the idea of ‘propaganda by the deed’ was very much bolstered by the widely criticized violent backlash of the Russian State.

International Anarchist bodies officially endorsed ‘propaganda by the deed’ soon after, most significantly in London in 1881 at the International Anarchist Conference. However, the International Anarchist Congress barely received a mention in the London papers, giving some clue as to the relative obscurity of Anarchists going into the 1880’s. Evidence of ‘propaganda by the deed’ was noted lightly by the British and international press through the 1880’s, but gained greater notoriety in May 1886 when a rally in support of workers in Chicago turned violent in what became known as the Haymarket Affair. As police attempted to dissolve the protest an unidentified individual threw a bomb at the police, which along with the subsequent gunfire, resulted in the deaths of eight police officers. The authorities in Chicago targeted Anarchists, who they believed responsible as Anarchist leaders in the city had aided in organizing some of the protestors. In the ensuing trials, four of the men were convicted and executed and another
committed suicide in prison; although the prosecution conceded that none of the eight Anarchists charged with murder had actually thrown the bomb. The case received widespread international press coverage and contributed to making Anarchism a household name.²⁵

The Haymarket case created a dual legacy. First, Anarchists, who staunchly defended the innocence of the men charged, felt that the American government, and by extension all governments, sought to repress Anarchism. Therefore, Anarchists perceived that Anarchism was at war with all governments. Anarchists memorialized the Chicago martyrs and conducted regular demonstrations in May of the subsequent years, creating May Day’s origins. As a result, violence against governments gained a greater acceptance among Anarchist circles. Second, and perhaps even more important, the international press and foreign governments decried the Haymarket Affair as a grave Anarchist attack on society. They represented the Haymarket Anarchists as depraved and amoral bombers who longed for death and destruction. The image of the bomb-wielding Anarchist was born in the press and took root in American and European minds. Each year May Day celebrations brought a fresh wave of fear and concern over Anarchists and their alleged deeds and aims.

In the Haymarket Affair we see the origins of a trend where Anarchism took on a public persona that partly distorted and partly reflected reality. While Anarchism continued as an ever evolving and widely varying movement, Anarchism in the public sphere became largely associated and known through perceived Anarchist ‘outrages’, or violent attacks on society. As the fear of Anarchists grew, an increasing number of events and even rumors were linked to Anarchism, and this public specter of Anarchism, in many ways, went far beyond the actual Anarchist movement. While the budding public image of Anarchism partly reflected the growing popularity of ‘propaganda by the deed,’ it also represented more widespread political

and social fears and anxieties. Within this context, Anarchist outrages became public spectacles that garnered incredible attention for brief periods of time.

While Anarchism was never a centrally organized movement, the public prominence of Bakunin gave disparate acts of Anarchist violence the appearance of centralized coordination and coherency. Bakunin’s successor as the public face of Anarchism, Prince Peter Kropotkin, rejected Bakunin’s ideas on struggle and violence and instead advocated peaceful and harmonious methods of reforming society. Despite Kropotkin’s public figure as the so-called ‘Prince of Peace,’ the popular image of Anarchists at the turn of the twentieth century remained closely associated with the violent ideas of Bakunin, as his hostile statements and the ensuing violent Anarchist actions received far greater attention from the press, cartoonists, and novelists.

The association between Anarchism and violence was widely depicted in literature, political propaganda, and cartoon representations. Popular novels, such as Fyodor Dostoevsky’s *The Possessed* (1872), Henry James’ *The Princess Casamassima* (1886), and Joseph Conrad’s *The Secret Agent* (1907), presented Anarchist individuals as violent, conspiratorial, fanatical, and a threat to the interests of all social classes. Political writers, especially figures such as German Social Democrat Wilhelm Liebknecht, portrayed Anarchists as misguided individuals whose only political creed was destruction. The Anarchist also became a popular motif for political cartoonists, who projected the trope of the Anarchist as a shadowy figure dressed in a black

---

26 The seemingly coordinated, worldwide threat of Anarchism inspired some early international cooperation among police. The Italians pushed for international cooperation as early as 1893, and the First International Conference for the Social Defense Against Anarchists was held in Rome in 1898 and was attended by the major European powers. At the conference the delegates largely debated the practical difficulties in identifying Anarchists and defining the Anarchist ideology. A follow-up conference was held in St. Petersburg in 1904, but neither conference achieved much coordination among police in practice. However, Mathieu Deflem has recently argued that informal discussions and meetings at the conference did contribute to early coordination and helped lead to the formation of Interpol a few years later. See Mathieu Deflem, “Wild Beasts Without Mercy: The Uncertain Origins of Interpol, 1898-1910” in *Handbook of Transnational Crime and Justice*, Ed. by Philip Reichel, 2005.

27 See, for example, Wilhelm Liebknecht’s pamphlet “Anarchism, Social Democracy, and Revolutionary Tactics” (1886), reprinted in *Wilhelm Liebknecht and German Social Democracy: A Documentary History*, Ed. By William A. Pelz and Translated by Erich Hahn, 1994.
cloak, carrying a spherical bomb with a long, smoking fuse. As a result, by the turn of the
century, the conception of Anarchists as violent individuals, destruction-seeking individuals had
become firmly established in European popular culture.

iii. THE EVOLUTION AND EXPANSION OF THE ENGLISH PRESS

The changing nature of the British press in the late-nineteenth century is perhaps the most
important context for understanding why Anarchism caused such a sense of fear, panic, and
moral outrage in Britain. This is especially striking as Britain had a relatively small,
disorganized, and often-peaceful Anarchist movement, particularly in comparison to the scale
and energy of the movement in France, Spain, Italy, and Russia at the turn of the century.28 As
historian Peter Marshall has noted, the first organized groups of Anarchists did not emerge in
Britain until the 1880’s, and, as a social movement, Anarchism remained “marginal” through the
end of the century.29 Yet it was in the British press that Anarchism took on a persona that was
larger than life and yielded a social and even political presence far beyond the limited existence
of the few Anarchist clubs and their scattered members.

The press culture in Britain experienced spectacular growth in the second half of the
nineteenth century. Between the 1850’s and 1880’s alone, some 420 newspaper companies were
formed in Britain. As early as 1896 Lloyd’s Weekly News was advertising a circulation of over
1,000,000 papers, a feat equaled just four years later by the Daily Mail. The growth in
newspaper proprietorship also illustrated the speed of new growth; in 1861 there were 114

28 For some statistics on the size of the Anarchist movement in Paris at the time, see John Merriman, The Dynamite
Club: How a Bombing in Fin-de-Siècle Paris Ignited the Age of Modern Terror, 2009. For a comparative sense of
scale, see Peter Marshall’s survey of Anarchist groups and movements by country and region in Demanding the
newspaper proprietors, but by 1911 that number had grown to nearly 2,900.\textsuperscript{30} One contemporary observer noted that since 1855 “the production of newspapers… has undergone a revolution. The newspaper has ceased to be an article of luxury, and has become a necessity of life.”\textsuperscript{31}

Indeed, in the second half of the nineteenth century, newspapers lost their association with aristocratic patronage and tedious reports of parliamentary speeches; they became instead big, industrialized, and professional businesses that sold a mix of news, gossip, and lurid stories catering to the demands of the growing mass of middle- and working-class readers.

Several factors accounted for the rapid expansion and evolution of newspapers into everyday life. Technological advances no doubt made it possible. Traditional manual presses gave way over the course of the nineteenth century to mechanized steam and eventually electric rotary presses, which by the 1890’s could print upwards of 90,000 papers per hour on a single machine.\textsuperscript{32} The spread of rail lines following the railway boom in the 1840’s allowed newspaper proprietors to quickly and efficiently distribute their papers to cities and towns across the British Isles, which over time led to the eclipse of many local papers by the London based press. Telegraph lines, first utilized by \textit{The Times} in 1844, disseminated news stories and rumors within hours across the whole of the British Empire. Advances in typesetting, the production of cheaper paper from wood pulp, and methods for printing pictures contributed to making newspapers easier and cheaper to print and more attractive to buy. Government regulations and taxes on newspapers also eased in the nineteenth century. The abolition of the Advertising Tax in 1853, the Stamp Act in 1855, and the Paper Duty in 1861 effectively ended the traditional ‘tax on reading,’ making papers substantially cheaper to buy. Concomitantly, Government regulation

\textsuperscript{31} “The Modern Newspaper” in \textit{The British Quarterly Review}, April 1872, p.351.
declined with the Newspaper Libel and Registration Act of 1881 and the Libel Law Amendment Act of 1888, which provided a greater degree of legal protection to newspaper proprietors against lawsuits.

Britain’s reading public also grew at a tremendous rate at the turn of the century, spurring the growth of new papers. The population in England and Wales alone nearly doubled between 1861 and 1911, climbing from just over 20 million persons to more than 36 million. The population increase was most dramatic in the rapidly industrializing cities, where industrial workers and middle-class professionals and businessmen came to dominate the demographic. These growing numbers were increasingly literate, in part due to educational reforms, especially the Elementary Education Act of 1870, which set up public elementary education and administration throughout England and Wales, and the Education Acts of 1880-1899, which made education compulsory for children up to the age of twelve.

This burgeoning readership took on greater political import as well with the growing enfranchisement in the Reform Acts of 1832 and 1867 and the Representation of the People Act in 1884, which cumulatively gave most British men the right to vote. Politics became decidedly mass, and politicians gave increasing attention to the press, from courting particular journalists to founding and sponsoring individual newspaper companies. The political focus on the press was accentuated after Gladstone's successful Midlothian campaign of open-air speeches in the General Election of 1880, which demonstrated the new power of the masses in politics. Unlike Gladstone's public speeches on his campaign trail, the new scale and reach of newspapers

---

provided the opportunity for politicians to reach a much larger audience much more quickly. Political leaders and those out of power could often be found writing letters or editorials to the leading papers, often using the opportunity to defend policies or cast accusations at political rivals. Politicians’ increasing attempts to manipulate the press, often through a system of rewards, including knighthoods and peerages, also demonstrated the press’ increasing political importance. One notable example was the case of Alfred Russell Harmsworth, owner of several popular papers at the turn of the century, including the *Daily Mail*. Harmsworth was made Lord Northcliff in 1905, and later Viscount in 1917, under the urging of Parliament members eager to carry his favor and media influence.

Despite sometimes conspicuous political ties, as Stephen Koss ably demonstrated in *The Rise and Fall of the Political Press in Britain* (1984), by the 1880’s newspapers were becoming, in reality, more independent as the political affiliation of newspapers and political control over papers was waning. This was largely because strong political leanings threatened to alienate potential readers and threatened potential sales and advertising revenues.\(^{36}\) Furthermore, the new reading public favored sensationalistic social stories, similar to those that had gained popularity by midcentury in the ‘Penny Dreadfuls,’ over political coverage. As newspapers became big business in the late-nineteenth century, the press slowly severed its ties with traditional aristocratic patronage, which had long propped up the papers as more of a philosophic mission to educate than a business, and the press became the domain of bourgeois businessmen, who brought in streamlined operations and larger advertising revenue and the often overriding notion of a bottom-line.

A new type of journalism, often referred to simply as ‘New Journalism,’ reflected many of the above trends and became a dominant archetype of turn-of-the-century newspapers. W.T.

---

Stead was a pioneer of this journalistic turn. Under his tenure from 1883-1889, Stead transformed the struggling *Pall Mall Gazette* by increasing revenues and catering to the expanding numbers of middle-class businessmen and professionals. Stead’s editorship embraced the sensational and the idea of moral outrage over simply reporting the news. He focused much of the paper’s energy around investigative stories about the failings and moral wrongs of British society. In 1885, for example, Stead began a series titled, “The Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon,” which attempted to uncover the widespread problem of juvenile prostitution. Further series highlighted the injustices of poverty, the dangers of criminals in London, the suppression of liberties by the police, and lurid details and speculation over the Jack the Ripper murders in Whitechapel. Stead often aimed his stories at the Government, attempting to use his paper to build public pressure for or against contentious social issues of his day.37 The ‘New Journalism’ of Stead and his contemporaries featured interviews, extensive use of photographs and illustrations, gossip columns, and large, front-page headlines often geared to shock readers. Social stories about immigration, alcohol, child labor, and moral decay became an integral aspect of most papers at the turn of the century, mixed in and often interwoven with more traditional news reports.38

Stead later lamented on the style of ‘New Journalism’ that he founded. In a 1904 editorial for the *Review of Reviews*, Stead argued that the press had become unfit and unwise advisors to the Government and the people. He claimed that a “brood of demoniacs appear to be in charge of some of our papers” and that editorials and exposés were more often than not

38 ‘New Journalism’ was a pejorative term first used in the 1880’s by Matthew Arnold to criticize the burgeoning style of sensationalist journalism. Some historians, most notably Joel Wiener in *Papers for the Millions: The New Journalism in Britain, 1850’s to 1914*, 1988, argue that many of the features of New Journalism were present in earlier Victorian newspapers. For an excellent summary of the ‘New Journalism,’ see Dennis Griffith’s *The Encyclopedia of the British Press*, 1992.
“criminal and homicidal”. He insisted that the papers of his day were often caught up in the fervor of scandals and that they advised the nation into reckless courses of action. His suggested solution, ironically no less dramatic than those he accused, was to round up the editors and owners of papers, such as *Daily Mail*, *The Evening Standard*, and *The Morning Post*, and execute them on Tower Hill like traitors of old. With the press’ newly elevated and respected position in public life, the trend of combining sensational stories with factual news often produced wildly sensationalized tales that were routinely perceived by the readership as trustworthy news.

The ‘New Journalism’ of the turn of the century Britain reflected many of the anxieties of the Edwardian age. The early positivism of the nineteenth century transitioned to a pervasive pessimism in the *fin-de-siècle* as Britons increasingly focused on what could be wrong or at fault in their society. Detailed social studies flourished at the time and contributed to the general sense of decay and decline, such as Charles Booth’s poverty study of London in the 1880’s and Seebohm Rowntree’s attack on *laissez-faire* liberalism and capitalism. Organizations dedicated to tackling the many perceived vices and problems of the times, such as the Salvation Army (1865) and the British Women’s Temperance Association (1876), also contributed to highlighting the general sense of decay. England’s newspapers capitalized on this mood and reprinted such reports, running editorials and exposés on the many fears and anxieties of their reading public. Sensationalistic news stories, such as the Jack the Ripper Murders in 1888 and the trial of Oscar Wilde in 1895, became a way for the British public to discuss what was wrong with society. What resulted was a press culture that mixed legitimate news and often exaggerated social fears, and the two became somewhat inseparable.

---

The press was not the only medium responsible for presenting anxieties of the age to the public in a sensationalized form. Popular fiction was another; the many novels of William Le Queux, for instance – some of which invoked the spectre of hidden networks of German spies at work in Britain – played a part in generating the ‘spy fever’ that gripped the British public at various points during the Edwardian period.\(^\text{41}\) Even ostensibly more sober media, such as the social investigations of time, relied on graphic and dramatic imagery. William Booth’s *In Darkest England* (1890) and Jack London’s *People of the Abyss* (1903) spoke of working-class “barbarians” and “savages” roaming the streets of England’s capital.\(^\text{42}\) Thus, whether the mediums were newspapers or novels, writers in Edwardian England wove tales of peril, conspiracy, social decay, and intrigue, and the British public readily devoured these sensationalized works, often blurring the line between fiction and reality.

**B. DISCUSSION ON SOURCES**

The majority of primary sources used in this work were taken from materials acquired at the British Libraries, particularly its Newspaper Library, including newspapers, serials, journal articles, novels, pamphlets, and the like. The British public’s fear of Anarchism was an issue that operated largely in the public sphere and at a time in British history when mass media both informed and reflected public opinion. Through the emerging and widespread use of mass media to win public support, to inform public views, and to attempt to guide public pressure on opponents the popular media also reflected the opinions and policies of those in Government. However, British presses were generally independent bodies by the 1890’s, and lawmakers did

not simply pull the strings of public consciousness by manipulating the articles that appeared in British newspapers. Rather, British mass media was the forum where all walks of English life could partake in British social and political events and make their opinions heard. The education reforms of the preceding years meant that most Englanders could read and write to some degree, and Britons from all socio-economic classes utilized newspapers and similar popular media to understand the world and express their opinions. Common citizens and a newly emerging group of ‘experts’ penned thousands of letters to the editors of British papers on all aspects of public life, and by the 1890’s the burgeoning English press had become a very dynamic public forum for all members of the nation to discuss and express their opinions on Britain’s social and political events.

Government documents from the National Archives were utilized alongside popular press articles to gauge the effect of public issues and opinions on Government policies and to gauge the less publicly touted views of Government officials on these issues. Government documents were often as alarmist and stereotyped as those of the mass media, and they granted exploration into the influence lawmakers gave the public sphere in their policy decision-making.

Government documents also indicated the evolving views of the British Government towards the public and towards itself. By comparing the timeline of the issues emerging in the mass media to the dates that these same issues emerged in Government documents, the use of Government documents created a clear understanding that the rise of New Liberalism in Government was not the guiding force of change that propagated the creation of a paternalistic State. Instead, New Liberalism arose as Government officials relented to public pressure for a stricter, more interventionist State.
Parliamentary debates were also employed to track how the perceived threat of Anarchism influenced Government policy. Through reading the debates that occurred in Parliament, it became transparent that the British Government was far less concerned than the greater British public by the threat of Anarchism, and any Anarchism-motivated policy change endorsed by the Government lagged well behind the public’s endorsement of that same change. The Parliamentary debates also illustrated the references to Anarchists that were used by Government officials. In other words, Anarchism became part of a new political lexicon of fear. Parliament members used references to, associations with, and comparisons to Anarchists and Anarchism to attack all manner of concerns, from political opponents to the Irish to new legislation.

C. DEFINING THE ‘OUTRAGE’

The British public at the turn of the century frequently employed the use of the term ‘outrage’ when discussing political and social affairs, including laws, crimes, and social phenomenon, such as poverty. The use of ‘outrage’ was especially common in the mass media, and ‘outrage’ frequently occurred in the most salacious newspaper headlines. In these instances the term ‘outrage’ applied to something, be it an act or an occurrence, which caused tremendous moral indignation in the mind of the greater British public.

‘Outrages’ became common labels for Anarchist attacks in Edwardian England, and it was through the perception that Anarchist crimes were ‘outrages’ that Anarchism became linked to the broad range of issues concerning Britons at the turn of the century. In the height of the second Industrial Revolution many smaller Anarchist crimes were reported on – small bomb
plots, public gunfights, and other violent acts – but the British public paid little attention to these crimes. Once Anarchist crimes became associated with the term ‘outrage,’ however, Anarchism in Britain began to take on a larger than life appearance that included highly stereotyped and dangerous individuals who oscillated between being hidden from society and being well-known by the State or foreign States.

The Anarchist ‘outrages’ always implied a perceived sense of surprise or shock and a gross oversimplification of the details, often to the point of absurdity. They involved a seemingly large Government presence and strong international connections, which enhanced the public perception that the State was at war with Anarchism and added an element of ‘uncontested’ proof to any argument concerning the Anarchists involved. Anarchist ‘outrages’ also typically adopted a widespread sense of impending catastrophe or decline and usually assumed a structure of what was ‘good and safe’ for the nation and what was ‘evil and bad.’ By adhering to the preceding framework the Anarchist ‘outrages’ that afflicted Britain at the turn of the century became elaborate spectacles – spectacles that captivated the whole of the English nation.

The theories of Guy Debord and Jean Baudrillard aided in understanding the development and the function of the Anarchist ‘outrages.’ According to Debord, spectacles played a unique role in the modern world; he claimed that modern life became a non-stop series of spectacles, quickly leaping from one spectacle to the next. He asserted that spectacles were images that were repeated until the image replaced any tangible reality. These images were not the result of media or political attempts to deceive the public. No one controlled these images; they became autonomous and moved only by the multitude of social forces exerted upon them. Spectacles also united seemingly disconnected phenomena; while a spectacle occurred, it
enveloped all that transpired around it and brought disparate things together as part of a new and singular understanding of the world.\textsuperscript{43}

Anarchism in England became a series of spectacles. These spectacles propagated an outpouring of images on Anarchism, which were then linked to the various and disconnected anxieties of British life already dominating the public commentary at the turn of the century. These images of Anarchism formed a relationship between British politicians, the media, and the host of individuals and groups that made up the British public. No one entity controlled the images of Anarchism, but the images joined the many groups who influenced and were influenced by them. As a result, the evolution of these images crafted a new understanding of Anarchism and British life at the time.

Jean Baudrillard’s concept of images and simulacra aided in understanding how the images associated with the Anarchist spectacles spread so widely and rapidly, quickly evolving from something harmless and virtually non-existent to something ubiquitous and catastrophic in only a few years. He claimed that the mass production of images following the Industrial Revolution blurred the line between what was real and what was an image, making it difficult to distinguish an image from reality. According to Baudrillard, the division between what was real and what was merely a representation of something real broke down under the sheer volume of mass reproduction, and consequently, the image prevailed and determined reality in this new landscape.\textsuperscript{44}

Baudrillard’s concept helps explain why the images of Anarchists were more important in England than the reality of Anarchists. The mechanized growth of the press in England toward the latter nineteenth-century bombarded the public with images, from pictures, cartoons, and

\textsuperscript{43} Guy Debord, \textit{The Society of the Spectacle}, Trans. By Fredy Perlman and Jon Supak, 1970.
drawings to news summaries and opinion columns, all asserting to represent what was happening in an increasingly large and complex world, far beyond the sight or comprehension of any one individual. Thus, the British public, particularly the sprawling urban populations, came to know and understand much of the world through these popular press images. The depictions of Anarchists captured in the press became ever more divorced from the actual Anarchist movement as their reproductions continued through time. In the fin-de-siècle, however, the image of the Anarchist became the reality for the British public. The image of the Anarchist was seen and discussed everywhere – in newspapers, trials, funerals, literature, crime tours, souvenirs, politics, and, ultimately, in gunfights in the heart of London. Anarchism and its images were seen in the dangers of immigration, in radical politics, and in the poverty of the industrial landscape. Due to these images, the public’s mental map of the world under the threat of Anarchism became real and, as a result, the image of Anarchism became far more powerful and important than the movement of Anarchism itself.

D. HISTORIOGRAPHY OF EDWARDIAN ENGLAND

The historiography on turn of the century Britain has been dominated by narrative accounts, biographies of figures such as Edward VII, and by a dogged insistence that English politics and society collapsed during the period. The first serious scholarship on the era originated in the late 1920’s, when a small group of academics sought to redress popular accounts of pre-War England that presented it as a harmonious and peaceful calm before the great storm of World War I. Elie Halevy’s pioneering work, The Rule of Democracy, 1905-1914 (1934), expressed regret for the loss of a harmonious liberal past. He was a philosopher who
believed, above all else, in personal liberty and strict limits on the power and encroachment of the Government. Halevy blamed the pre-War era for destroying the Liberal Government and liberal ideology – the champions of the individual. He argued that the decades before the Great War were a time of chaos and disorder, destroying all that was stable and good in England. It was George Dangerfield, however, who popularized this view. His seminal work, *The Strange Death of Liberal England* (1935), remains in print to this day and has continued to dominate discussions of Edwardian England. Dangerfield combined the narratives of four crises in early twentieth-century Britain: the suffragettes, working-class strikes, Irish Nationalism, and the conflict over the House of Lords’ Veto. He contended that in 1910 pressures that had long been smoldering flared up, and “by the end of 1913 Liberal England was reduced to ashes.”

According to Dangerfield, the reckless behavior of some Britons before the War led the general public to abandon the values that had once made Britain pre-eminent.

Few scholars challenged these assumptions in the 1940’s and 1950’s, and they largely eschewed historical analysis for dry narratives of Edward VII’s reign. In the 1960’s, social historians began to look at the late-Victorian and Edwardian period as a time of technological change. R.J. Minney’s *The Edwardian Age* (1964) asserted that, “It was a brief age, spanning little more than nine years, but the impress of [Edward VII’s] personality was so powerful and the changes within that narrow span so varied and enduring that it has attained an honourable place alongside the goliath age of Victoria…” He discussed the introduction of planes, electricity, wireless communications, cinema, and motoring; although, his focus was primarily on the experiences of Edward VII.

---

Samuel Hynes broke new ground in *The Edwardian Turn of Mind* (1968), focusing on widespread movements, such as labor strikes and new literary conventions, from a very different point of view. Unlike Dangerfield, who saw all English events from the outlook of Whitehall, Hynes sympathetically described the events from the perspective of the common actors. However, his largely narrative account, while more sympathetic to the participants, continued to reinforce the Dangerfield thesis that pre-War England was simply chaotic and destructive; the actors may have had cause to strike or protest or reject their Victorian fetters, but the result was, nonetheless, destruction and decay.

Paul Thompson criticized previous scholars of late-Victorian and Edwardian Britain in the 1970’s with his book, *The Edwardians* (1975). Thompson argued that the prevalence of narrative accounts had not advanced historians’ understanding of the period. He also blamed his predecessors for their focus on top-down politics: “The great political conflicts of these years were not manufactured, as we are sometimes led to believe, at Whitehall breakfast parties. They were manifestations of a deep self-questioning at all levels of society, which shadowed the confidence of Britain as still, seemingly, the world’s most powerful nation. Innumerable unknown Edwardians gave their life’s enthusiasm to the creation of a better society…”^47^ While Thompson’s work showed flashes of brilliance, his insights were largely undeveloped in the book and buried underneath transcripts of interviews he had conducted with surviving Edwardians. However, Thomson’s call combined with the growing public debates in the late 1970’s over the fate of Britain’s welfare system led to a new strand of scholarship on the period that sought to trace the origins of the modern welfare state to turn of the century Britain.

Pat Thane’s work typified this new trend. In her edited collection, *The Origins of British Social Policy* (1978), Thane asserted that a few radical New Liberals, such as Lloyd George, had

---

attempted to pacify social unrest in Britain by incorporating a small number of Socialist inspired policies. Unfortunately, Thane’s account did little to challenge old conventions, and she tended to marginalize these policies by asserting that they were only the half-hearted efforts of a few at the top who still believed in traditional liberal politics. For Thane, the British did not begin real social and political reconstruction until the 1930’s.

Bernard Porter, in his work, The Origins of the Vigilant State: The London Metropolitan Police Special Branch Before The First World War (1987), rejected Dangerfield’s thesis that the Edwardian period was a destructive period; instead, he asserted that the Edwardian period was a constructive period—a time that laid the foundation for and initiated England’s twentieth-century interventionist State. Porter argued that the transition from the lack of a secret police in mid-Victorian times to the establishment of the Metropolitan Police’s Special Branch by 1900 mirrored the nation’s transition from a laissez-faire liberal State to a modern interventionist State. He claimed that the transition illustrated the tremendous fear, both real and imagined, present at the turn of the century. I agree with Porter’s general long-term conclusions, although I contend that turn of the century Anarchist stereotypes played a greater role. Although Porter devoted a chapter to Anarchism in Edwardian England, he argued that the Fenian bombings in the 1880’s were a far more significant catalyst for change. Additionally, I believe that the process was more of a cultural transition, occurring primarily through the British media, rather than the predominately political and behind-the-scenes transition advocated by Porter.

Despite the influx of scholarship on the origins of the welfare state, most academics remained firmly rooted in the Dangerfield thesis. Many seemed merely to reenact Dangerfield’s research; they claimed, like Dangerfield, to be combating the myth of pre-War peace and utopia in Britain. Works such as George Bernstein’s Liberalism and Liberal Politics in Edwardian
England (1986), David Brooks’ The Age of Upheaval: Edwardian Politics, 1899-1914 (1995), and John Patterson’s Edwardians (1996) have carried Dangerfield’s mantle to new generations. David Powell’s The Edwardian Crisis, 1901-1914 (1996) was nearly an updated edition of Dangerfield, analyzing the same topics in the same order. Powell’s book demonstrated far greater historical accuracy but offered little beyond the theme of chaos and destruction.

The most influential modern work on the period has undoubtedly been Jonathan Rose’s The Edwardian Temperament, 1895-1919 (1986). Rose examined intellectual shifts during the period, and he came to the conclusion that fundamentally new ideas and new preoccupations emerged in the Edwardian era, such as an urge to reconcile hostilities, a deep concern with the meaning of life, and a new focus on efficiency. Nonetheless, Rose’s work remains extremely limited. He noted in his introduction that he was only concerned with the intelligentsia, and even then only with a few emerging ideas he found particularly interesting. Scholars have generally not looked for shifts among the broader British public at the time, nor have they connected these changes to transformations in policy, such as early welfare legislation.

While many able historical monographs since the 1970’s have studied the individual histories of Suffragettes, working-class, immigrant communities, Socialists, Irish, and, to a lesser extent, Anarchists in late-Victorian and Edwardian Britain, they have tended to focus on these histories from the perspective of the groups themselves and have ignored the important role that the actions and popular stereotypes of these groups played in the broader British political culture. Two of the most in depth studies of Anarchists in England were conducted by John Quail, The Slow Burning Fuse (1978), and Hermia Oliver, The International Anarchist Movement in Late Victorian Britain (1983). Quail focused on the merits of Anarchist efforts from the perspective of a contemporary supporter of the Anarchist movement; he found value in the actions of turn of
the century English Anarchists and aimed to use these Anarchists as an instructive lesson for the present. Oliver was concerned with the introduction of Anarchist ideas into Britain, focusing her work on the internal politics of the Anarchist movement, and had little interest in Anarchism’s broader effect on the British nation.

Most studies on Anarchism have only examined the Anarchist movement itself, and studies exploring Anarchism’s influence on social or political change have been largely neglected. One of the few exceptions is that of noted historian, Eric Hobsbawm, in the 2007 edition of his book *Revolutionaries* (1973). Hobsbawm published an essay, titled “Reflections on Anarchism,” that discussed the role of Anarchists as agents of change in modern Europe. Hobsbawm dismissed Anarchism with little consideration, stating, “…no amount of sympathy can alter the fact that anarchism as a revolutionary movement has failed, that it has almost been designed for failure.”

This dissertation will place Anarchists, or at least the public perception of them, at the center of Edwardian England’s social and political life by analyzing the stereotypes of Anarchists that figured so prominently in public discussions of the era. Scholarship regarding the influences of stereotypes on political and social change have included stereotypes of peoples of African and Jewish descent in Britain, such as Paul Hartmann and Charles Husband’s *Racism and the Mass Media: A Study of the Role of the Mass Media in the Formation of White Beliefs and Attitudes in Britain* (1974), Jeffrey Green’s *Black Edwardians: Black People in Britain, 1901-1914* (1998), and Lloyd Gartner’s *The Jewish Immigrant in England, 1870-1914* (2001). These authors have explored the role of stereotypes in repressing the lives and activities of black and Jewish British individuals, but such works have not explored the wider impact of such stereotypes on British society and politics at large. Recent studies of British imperialism, such as
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Catherine Hall’s *Civilizing Subjects: Colony and Metropole in the English Imagination, 1830-1867* (2002), have been some of the few works to examine the effects of stereotypes on the larger British consciousness, although these works were typically concerned with the early Victorian period and only with images of colonials.

Haia Shpayer-Makov explored the influence of stereotypes on the larger British public in her 1988 article published in *Victorian Studies*. Specifically, Shpayer-Makov’s paper, “Anarchism in British Public Opinion 1880-1914”, examined the influence of Anarchist stereotypes and images on the people of Edwardian England. She argued that because the Edwardian era was a time of such overwhelming generalized anxiety the stereotypes of Anarchists in England, too, became overwhelmingly exaggerated and worrisome. British citizens were already so fearful at the turn of the century that they simply embraced Anarchism as one more element to fear. According to Shpayer-Makov, the public’s fear of Anarchists maintained the political and social status quo for the British public and did not influence the tremendous change that had occurred by the start of World War I.

By studying the stereotypes and images of Anarchists at the turn of the century in England and by exploring the media debates these stereotypes spawned among the public, I will disagree with Shpayer-Makov and argue that Anarchist stereotypes and images pushed the English public away from the status quo and toward the interventionist and paternalistic Government of the twentieth century.
E. OBJECTIVES OF THE DISSERTATION

The following dissertation analyzes a series of crimes, which began in 1892 with an alleged Anarchist bomb plot in Walsall and continued until early 1911 when London’s Metropolitan Police laid siege to an Anarchist hideout in the East End. However, this dissertation is not concerned with discovering the facts of the crimes or in following the court cases after the crimes; such aspects have been well documented over the years and have been the subject of many crime novels, movies, and historical reconstructions. This dissertation is also not concerned with the Anarchists involved in the cases or with the actions or objectives of Anarchists residing in England.

Instead, this dissertation concentrates on the anti-Anarchist dialogue that exploded in the popular press in the wake of these Anarchist ‘outrages.’ For nearly twenty years, British newspapers filled their pages with interpretations and analyses of these crimes and of Anarchism as all members of the English public, from working-class laborers to the aristocracy, theorized on the dangers of Anarchism in Britain. These crimes became a way for the nation to discuss such wide-ranging topics as liberalism, labor, immigration, poverty, and national degeneration. Popular periodicals editorialized on these Anarchist ‘outrages,’ and these crimes were also amply reflected in satirical poetry and political cartoons. The British public utilized these crimes to assert their perspectives and their criticisms on the current state of England and to suggest new

49 Crime novels and pamphlets on the “Houndsditch Murders” and the “Siege of Sidney Street” proliferated well into the 1940’s. See, for example, J.P. Eddy’s The Mystery of ‘Peter the Painter’: The Story of the Houndsditch Murders, and The Siege of Sidney Street and the Hunt for ‘Peter the Painter’, 1946. The most famous cinematic interpretation of the crimes was Alfred Hitchcock’s The Man Who Knew Too Much, 1934. The most scholarly and able reconstruction of the crimes, based on substantial research in the archives of the Records Office of the Corporation of the City of London, is Donald Rumbelow’s The Houndsditch Murders and The Siege of Sidney Street, 1988.
concepts of Government which laid the foundations for the paternalistic and interventionist State adopted after World War I.

As one commentator in *The Fortnightly Review* stated, “A fusillade of Anarchist bullets, poured in broad daylight from the windows of a house in Stepney, has startled the British public. If a volcano had burst into eruption at his feet, the Londoner would not have been more astounded. His solid British earth was, for the moment, rocking beneath him.”

Another observer noted, “Recent events in the East End of London have attracted public attention to a peril which has hitherto been seldom noticed by the public.” There was a widespread belief among the general public that these Anarchist ‘outrages’ had unmasked a hidden danger within England and that, as a result of this danger, many of Britain’s social and political customs were no longer tenable. In response, individuals from a host of political, ethnic, and class backgrounds felt compelled to reexamine their social, economic, and political differences through the lens of these crimes. In short, Englanders saw a simulacrum of their own problems in the exploits of a few Anarchists.

Based on the public’s discourses regarding Anarchism in Edwardian England, this dissertation argues that the public debates emerging from the Anarchist ‘outrages’ of 1892-1911 altered the self-conception of Britain’s political culture. In doing so, this dissertation will develop three main themes. First, Anarchists became equated with unmitigated violence, and any affiliation between Anarchism and politics was lost. Rather than seeing Anarchists as adherents of a certain political ideology, Englanders viewed Anarchists as diseased and abnormal individuals who bombed and assassinated, not to achieve a political goal, but because of their perverse desire for death and destruction. The second theme that will be developed is that a
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widespread fear of violent Anarchists dominated British political, social, and economic debates. The myriad of pre-existing fears vexing Britons at the turn of the century became embodied by the omnipotent menace of Anarchism. Immigration became the importation of Anarchists into England; the plight of the urban poor became the creation of Anarchists, and State’s inability to control Anarchists became evidence that the British nation was crumbling. The third and final theme developed by this dissertation is that the political debates generated by the fear of Anarchism led to a reconceptualization of the British State and its relationship to the individual and the social body. The English public’s expectations of Government changed as a result of the exhaustive discourse on the dangers of Anarchism in England. Within this period of discursive frenzy, the seeds of England’s postwar, interventionist State were laid, born from collective anxieties that reshaped British notions of society, Government, and the individual.

F. OVERVIEW OF THE DISSERTATION

Anarchism became the way in which the British public understood and debated the anxieties of the Edwardian era. The public’s fear of Anarchism allowed British citizens to criticize the institutions and liberal ideologies of the Victorian era and justify the creation of new and more interventionist methods of Government adopted in the early twentieth century. Four Anarchist outrages, the outrages of Walsall, Greenwich, Tottenham, and Sydney Street, shaped the English public’s fear of Anarchism. The extensive press coverage of each of these Anarchist outrages became increasingly intermingled with the anxieties of fin-de-siècle Britain and created a chronological narrative of the British’s people’s shifting beliefs on Government and the individual.
During this time of transition, Anarchism in England existed in three different and discrete realities – the philosophical, the actual, and the stereotypical. These distinct realities, despite their collective label of Anarchism, had very little in common with one another. The philosophical reality of Anarchism represented Anarchism as an idea and was a mostly passive and intellectual movement. There were a few Anarchist theorists that advocated violence; however, the vast majority did not utilize or support violence. Unlike the stereotype that became so prevalent in popular opinion, Anarchism’s intellectuals, even those who condoned violence, were rational and highly political individuals.

Most Anarchists in England participated in the Anarchist movement simply by patronizing local Anarchist clubs, and a handful of small, local Anarchist clubs formed the tangible reality of Anarchism in England. England’s Anarchist clubs were highly fluid organizations that disdained regulations and structure, and most served primarily as community centers. These clubs were neighborhood gathering places and cooperative organizations where individuals could acquire or offer help in a wide variety of matters, most painfully mundane. Local Anarchist clubs functioned as meeting places for the working-classes to drink, talk, and share in common activities. Occasionally, the clubs gave Anarchism-themed speeches or sang Anarchist songs, but much like the Socialist and Chartist clubs earlier in nineteenth century, political activities were fairly rare. Sporadically, extreme members of England’s Anarchists clubs committed acts of violence in the name of Anarchism, but such individuals were generally acting alone without the knowledge of or any organization by their local club.

The greater British public was not well-acquainted with Anarchism’s philosophical ideals or with England’s local Anarchist community at the turn of the century. However, the English public was well-acquainted with a vast array of fears in the fin-de-siècle, and this was a time
when fear, rumors of conspiracy, and evidence of national decline had the potential to sell a million newspapers per day. Thus, the English presses emphasized the violence and destruction of a few Anarchists and speculated on Anarchist conspiracies in Great Britain. Based upon images of Anarchism portrayed by the popular press, the stereotype of Anarchism became the reality of Anarchism for the general English public. By the early 1900s the Anarchist stereotype was far removed from either the philosophical ideal or the local actuality. The stereotype asserted that Anarchists were deranged and irrational actors with larger than life capabilities and larger than life connections and that the Anarchist movement was a highly organized, violent, and conspiratorial collective that ranged across the whole of Europe. Although the stereotype of Anarchism was exceedingly unrealistic, this erroneous stereotype persisted as the British public’s perception of Anarchism, and it was the stereotype of Anarchism rather than the movement itself that propagated the tremendous change in public opinion regarding the rights of the individual and the responsibilities of the Government.

Anarchism’s stereotype in England originated, largely, in response to the Walsall Outrage in 1892. In the Walsall Outrage, British police uncovered an alleged bomb making plot by French, Italian, and English Anarchists in a factory in Walsall. Through the media coverage of the Walsall case, the British public associated particularly malicious violence with Anarchism. As a result of its link with wanton violence Anarchism became depoliticized, and the movement was divorced from any political legitimacy.

The Greenwich Outrage occurred two years later and furthered the link between Anarchism and violence when a French Anarchist attempted to detonate a bomb at the Greenwich Royal Observatory. While the Walsall crimes introduced the nation to the notion of Anarchism in England, no violence was actually perpetrated by the Walsall criminals. The
Greenwich Observatory bombing, however, brought the Anarchist violence that was plaguing continental Europe into England. As a result of the Greenwich Outrage and its predominantly medical and scientific analysis, Anarchism was equated to a disease which could be transmitted or inherited. Anarchists, according to the British public, were diseased people with abnormal, amoral, and debauched characters. Consequently, the public feared that the disease of Anarchism would spread across England and endanger the nation.

The years between the Greenwich Outrage and the Tottenham Outrage are referred to in this work as the ‘Gap Years’ and extended from 1895 to 1908. Press coverage of Anarchism during this time illustrated the dramatic shift that occurred in British public opinion from 1895 to 1908 as Anarchism evolved to represent the many anxieties of the Edwardian era. During the ‘Gap Years’ no Anarchist outrages occurred in England, but several crucial events transpired to increase the English public’s fear of Anarchists. Firstly, during these years a spate of Anarchist assassinations occurred throughout Europe and in America and convinced the public that Anarchists represented a legitimate danger to heads of state. Secondly, the ‘Gap Years’ were a time of tremendous anxiety over the large numbers of immigrants pouring into the British Isles. As Anarchists were increasingly linked to immigrants during this time, the public feared that immigration was a way for Anarchists to enter England. Thirdly, the First Russian Revolution occurred during the ‘Gap Years,’ and the British press linked the Russian rebels to Anarchism. Thus, as thousands of Russian citizens fled the violence in Russia and immigrated into England, the British public increasingly feared that violent Russian Anarchists were taking up residence in Great Britain. Lastly, the notion of extreme individualism arose during the ‘Gap Years,’ and the fear of extreme individuals prompted Englanders to question the safety of the Government’s liberal ideology which glorified individual rights and freedoms.
The link between Anarchism and the already existing *fin-de-siècle* fears that had been built during the ‘Gap Years’ was solidified by the Tottenham Outrage, in 1909. After the Tottenham Outrage, the British public inextricably linked national concerns, such as the burgeoning immigrant population, to the dangers of Anarchism. In the Tottenham Outrage, two Russian Anarchists robbed a payroll on a roadside in Tottenham and fled in a dramatic chase that involved a large mob of armed police and civilians. Ultimately, two British citizens were killed and numerous others were injured in the pursuit, which filled London’s streets with gunfire and caused widespread property damage. As a result of the Tottenham Outrage, the link between Anarchism and immigration that had been building over the ‘Gap Years’ was cemented within British public consciousness, and English citizens equated Russians with Anarchists. As Russians were perceived to be especially powerful and dangerous Anarchists, the Tottenham Outrage assured the people of Britain that particularly dangerous Russian Anarchists were invading England under the guise of immigration and political asylum.

The Sydney Street Outrage encapsulated two sets of crimes, known independently as the Houndsditch Affair in late 1910 and the Siege of Sydney Street in early 1911. In the Houndsditch Affair, a gang of Russian Anarchists were interrupted by police during a robbery in the East End, and the Anarchists shot the police officers, killing three of them and crippling two. Two weeks later, two of the Anarchists suspected of the Houndsditch crimes were cornered in an apartment building in Stepney, and for several hours the British police and military waged a siege against the two Anarchists. The siege, which was widely described in the press and witnessed first-hand by thousands of Londoners, involved hundreds of police and military, heavy artillery, and several high Government officials before the building eventually caught fire and killed the two suspects.
The Sydney Street Outrage confirmed to Britons that all immigrants were Anarchists, and any conversation on immigration thereafter was, by default, a conversation on Anarchism. The public believed that left unchecked immigrants would degrade and, ultimately, destroy England. Poor social conditions were also connected to Anarchism, and the public feared that England’s urban poor would turn to Anarchism in protest of the wretched living and working conditions in the urban boroughs. British citizens widely perceived that the siege against the two Anarchists had been botched, and they blamed the Government and traditional liberalism for the Anarchist menace afflicting the nation. Therefore, in the wake of the Sydney Street Outrage, the British public demanded social and political reform to replace liberalism with a stricter, safer, and more interventionist State that would better protect England from the dangers of Anarchism.
II.

THE APOLITICAL ANARCHIST: THE WALSALL OUTRAGE, 1892

“It is… rather startling to be assured that a quiet manufacturing town in the Midlands has for many months been the centre of a grave criminal conspiracy, a leading part in which has been taken by Englishmen, and in which the leading Anarchists of the chief Continental capitals are probably involved.”

*Birmingham Daily Post*, 9 January 1892.

In early 1892 threats of Anarchist violence emerged in Walsall in the West Midlands of England and gripped the English imagination with fear. The media followed the case closely for months, filling their pages with rumors and speculations about Anarchist bombs and conspiracies. The press and the public knew little of Anarchism before these events, and that open space was filled with gossip and conjecture often presented as fact and expertise. Anarchism became a watchword in the English press, and the Anarchist stereotype took shape as the public grappled to understand the shocking reports surrounding the Walsall case. The widespread press coverage created the impression that Anarchism was everywhere and that it threatened the future of civilization.

Through the public debates that emerged around the newfound fear of Anarchism, Anarchism in England was discredited as a political ideology. The tenets of Anarchism were deemed illegitimate, and its adherents were denounced as individuals with moral failings rather than political grievances. Anarchism was divorced from the political sphere and became a
derogatory label to identify persons and beliefs considered dangerous. Thus, the Walsall Outrage brought Anarchism in England into the public spotlight, initiated fears of a widespread Anarchist threat, and effectively depoliticized Anarchism in England.

A. ENGLAND ON THE EVE OF THE WALSALL OUTRAGE

i. A GENERALIZED STATE OF ANXIETY

By the 1890’s England, like much of Europe, was experiencing a prolonged sense of anxiety stemming from both real and imagined threats. The mid-Victorian optimism and relative calm that had characterized the 1850’s and 1860’s began to unravel by the 1870’s. Beginning in 1873 key economic indicators suggested that the economy was faltering. While there is more recent evidence suggesting this was perhaps more perception than reality, it nonetheless caused considerable panic well into the 1890’s. A new immigration wave from Eastern Europe, many fleeing the violent Russian pogroms, also caused a great deal of concern. Although England had a long history of immigration and even anti-immigrant sentiments, this was the first major wave of immigrants since the rapid expansion of the press in the 1860’s and its turn towards sensationalism in the 1870’s. Newspapers, such as the Pall Mall Gazette and the new Daily Mail, lamented the presence of Eastern European immigrants, and typically described them as physically and morally inferior to the British – a poison to the social body. Social problems,
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such as crime, poverty, and sanitation, also appeared to be escalating out of control in the rapidly burgeoning English cities. In part, this was due to the unstructured changes wrought by the Second Industrial Revolution in England, but its fearful perception was also due to the statistical surveys, the rise of middle-class charitable organizations, and the press exposés that became commonplace in late-Victorian England. In the Empire, the Irish Catholics threatened rebellion, and the so-called “Irish Question” came to dominate political discussions by the 1880’s. Abroad, nationalist fears fuelled international rivalries and national anxieties, particularly after German unification in 1870 threatened the balance of power that had kept the peace in Europe since the fall of Napoleon. Nationalist competition for territories and changing military and population strengths in Europe and America resulted in intense self-scrutiny in England and exacerbated already extant fears of national failing.

Prior to the Walsall Outrage Anarchism was not deemed a threat to England, and it was given relatively little notice. Unlike the Continent, where the movement gained traction in the 1860’s and 1870’s, in England Anarchism’s presence was slight, confined largely to a few, mostly German and Italian Anarchist clubs in the East End of London and in the West Midlands, a small number of Anarchist publications, and the occasional Anarchist intellectual from the Continent, seeking refuge in England’s relatively lax acceptance of political radicals. Although the Anarchist doctrine of ‘propaganda by the deed,’ or the use of public and violent actions to shock and inspire change, had led to assassinations in Russia by the late 1870’s, the movement rarely attracted the attention of the English public through the 1880’s. Even the International Anarchist Conference held in London in 1881, which officially endorsed the doctrine of ‘propaganda by the deed’ just months after the assassination of Tsar Alexander II in Russia, garnered little mention from the English press. Scattered news reports concerning Anarchists
came primarily from foreign reports, particularly from the Anarchist demonstrations and riots in France in 1883, from the dynamite scares in Berne in 1885 and in Vienna in 1886, and from the Haymarket Riot in America in 1886.53

Even on the eve of the Walsall plot, Anarchism failed to attract significant concern in England. The case of John Borlas, an Anarchist poet arrested on 29 December 1891, was indicative of the status given to Anarchism prior to the Walsall Outrage. Borlas was arrested in Westminster for firing several rounds from his revolver at the House of Commons. When the arresting officer confronted him, Borlas declared, “I am an Anarchist, and I intended shooting you; but then I thought it a pity to shoot an honest man. What I have done is to show my contempt for the House of Commons.”54 Reactions from the press were largely sympathetic; an article in the Pall Mall Gazette, typically one of the more sensationalized papers at the time, described the Anarchist in elegant tones. The Pall Mall Gazette claimed that he was a “young Byron,” “handsome as a demi-god,” and a “gentleman” who gave away his wealth to the poor. His violent Anarchist act was dismissed as a “nervous irritation” from being tragically misunderstood. His self-proclaimed affiliation with Anarchism warranted no more than the briefest matter-of-fact mention.55

53 For a discussion of the spread of Anarchism in Britain in the 1880’s, see Hermia Oliver, The International Anarchist Movement in Late Victorian London, 1983; and Peter Marshall, Demanding the Impossible: A History of Anarchism, 1992. For one of the earliest English reports linking Anarchism and violence on the continent see The Times, 28 April 1879. For an example of the press following the Anarchist demonstrations in Paris see the Pall Mall Gazette, 17 March 1883. Accounts of the Berne bomb scare can be found in The Times, 17 February 1885; and the Vienna dynamite scare in Lloyd’s Weekly Newspaper, 10 October 1886. One of the only contemporary explorations of the London Anarchists appeared in the Pall Mall Gazette on 10 August 1887 and accused the Anarchists of being foreign thieves and murderers. The other significant story concerning Anarchism in England appeared in 1888 when both the Pall Mall Gazette and Daily Standard reported that a shadowy Russian Anarchist named Nikolay Vasiliev might be responsible for the Whitechapel murders. For details see the Pall Mall Gazette and the Daily Standard editions of 28 November 1888.
54 See Liverpool Mercury, 1 Jan 1892; and Reynolds’s Newspaper, 3 January 1892.
55 Pall Mall Gazette, 7 January 1892.
ii. THE IRISH INFLUENCE ON ENGLAND’S PERCEPTION OF THE
ANARCHIST THREAT

The pronounced fear of Anarchism in England began with the Walsall case in early 1892. However, it was the particular context in which the Walsall Outrage occurred that enabled the case to grab public attention and remain in the spotlight for so long. In England, subversive groups and bombs had a long tradition of fear and suspicion, going back to the English Catholics and the failed Gunpowder Plot to destroy the assembled Parliament and King in the House of Lords in 1605. The foiled bombing lived on in popular memory, and the English continued to mark the date with fireworks, bonfires, and burning effigies. The Government, too, bore a long memory of the event; the monarch only entered the Houses of Parliament once a year, and that date was marked with a ritualized search of the cellars under Westminster for any signs of explosives.\(^{56}\)

In the nineteenth century, bomb fears surfaced in England in 1858 when Felice Orsini attempted to assassinate Napoleon III in Paris, killing eight and wounding nearly 150 with his explosives. It was soon discovered that the bombings were planned by Italian nationalists in England and that the “Orsini bombs” were manufactured in Birmingham. The affair shook the British public and led to the downfall of Palmerston’s Government later that same year.\(^{57}\) In 1867 the Irish Fenians detonated explosives in London during the Fenian jailbreak of Richard O’Sullivan-Burke, a Republican Brotherhood gunrunner. The jailbreak was planned from inside the prison by O’Sullivan-Burke himself and utilized some 200 pounds of gunpowder placed by accomplices along the outer perimeter of the prison walls which bordered busy London streets.

The miscalculated explosion demolished the prison yard and many of the neighboring buildings and homes, killing twelve and seriously injuring 126, most of whom were innocent bystanders. *The Times* echoed a common refrain a few days after the attempted jailbreak, lamenting that a “crime of unexampled atrocity has been committed in the midst of London” whose result was “the slaughter of a number of innocent people; the burning and damaging of women and helpless infants, the destruction of poor men’s homes and poor men’s property.”58 The Fenian prison bombing in London unleashed a flurry of press descriptions, visceral images, and tales of destruction and human carnage and contributed to decades of condemnation and fear of Irish immigrants in England.59

The invention of dynamite in 1867 by Swedish chemist and engineer Alfred Bernhard Nobel greatly expanded the use of bombs by political radicals as dynamite was safer and simpler to use than gunpowder and more destructive in its results. Nobel’s invention of dynamite meant that it was possible to build a bomb which could cause a massive explosion yet could be manufactured, transported, and placed with relative ease and security. Nobel’s invention of the fulminate mercury detonation process also meant that bombs could be timed for detonation to occur minutes or hours after they had been planted so that it was no longer necessary to be physically present when detonating a bomb.60 Thus, dynamite enabled individuals and small groups to wreak a disproportionate amount of damage and to conduct themselves with relative obscurity. The invention of dynamite furthered the general sense of unease in England as technology, prized in the earlier part of the century as the glorious future of mankind, also

58 *The Times*, 16 December 1867.
became a source of fear. This disquiet can be seen in the many investigative reports of the 1870’s and 1880’s into the nature and social meaning of dynamite in England, such as the following excerpt from an article entitled simply “DYNAMITE” in 1883:

We have been told very loudly and frequently by a certain class, of late years, that science is the providence of man. If so it seems to be exceedingly blind and wayward. Although many of its discoveries have contributed much to the sum of human happiness, there are others which have added materially to the terrors and misery of mankind. This providence at times appears to be infernal rather than Divine. The invention of dynamite may be considered to be one of its latest fruits, and a bitter one it is.\(^6^1\)

The Irish bombing spree from 1881-1885 extensively utilized dynamite in England and Scotland. Dynamite bombs were so prevalent in London during these years that *The Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science, and Art* deplored the omnipresence of a “dynamite war” by 1883.\(^6^2\) Bombs were planted in many high-profile and often symbolic locations, including the London Underground, the offices of *The Times*, the House of Commons, the Tower of London, the London Bridge, and, perhaps most embarrassingly for the State, at the headquarters of the Criminal Investigation Department (CID) and Special Irish Branch. Some bombs caused little human damage while others inflicted considerable injury, such as the explosion in Paddington Station on 30 October 1883 that wounded nearly 70 people. The press responded to the Irish bombings with indignation, often characterizing the Fenians as savage animals in both their appearance and temperament.\(^6^3\) The bombings appeared so frequent that the author noted in *The Times*:

Mysterious explosions now-a-days occur in London with the regular irregularity which tempts the statistical mind to strike an average, and thus bring them under the reign of law. The chance of an explosion in

\(^{61}\) See “DYNAMITE” in *After Work*, August 1883, p.143.
\(^{63}\) For good examples of this, see the cartoons in *FUN*, 11 June 1884, p.255; and *FUN*, 9 December 1885, p.253.
any given month will shortly be calculable, and after time the date may even accumulate to such an extent as to fix the probable locality of the next catastrophe.\textsuperscript{64}

The Irish bombing spree had numerous effects on the English public and the State. The public was inundated with press stories and features describing and recounting the horrors of each event as well as the barbarity of the perpetrators. Literature took this fear a step further as an explosion of both real and fictional books featuring the explosive power of dynamite flooded the English landscape. For example, Donald MacKay’s \textit{The Dynamite Ship} (1888) described a future Fenian revolution fueled by dynamite. In the story, three Republicans took a steam-boat and retrofitted it for destructive purposes. The ship was made to be stealthy, with no visible steam or smoke and no identifying markings, and the ship was fitted with machinations to launch dynamite projectiles. Sneaking into London via the Thames, the ship proceeded to destroy the whole of London, leading to a forced renegotiation of Irish Home Rule.\textsuperscript{65} The Fenian ship’s secrecy and destructive power certainly echoed the fears of the time. The obscurity afforded by timed dynamite explosions, along with the fact that dynamite could be used to great effect by a only few persons, instilled within the British public a fear of secret conspiracies and dangerous figures hiding within the borders of England. This stoked anti-immigrant sentiments against the Irish and the Eastern Europeans.

The Government in England responded to the Irish bombings by imposing restrictions on dynamite in the Explosives Act of 1875 and the Explosive Substances Act of 1883 and by subjecting the Irish to the Coercion Act in 1881, which allowed British police to arrest and imprison suspected Irish militants without trial. The British Government also established the

\textsuperscript{64} \textit{The Times}, 27 February 1884.  
\textsuperscript{65} Donald MacKay, \textit{The Dynamite Ship}, 1888. See also Robert Louis Stevenson and Fanny Van de Grift Stevenson, \textit{The Dynamiter}, 1885. For a broader survey of Victorian literature on terrorism, see Alex Houen, \textit{Terrorism and Modern Literature: From Joseph Conrad to Ciaran Carson}, 2002.
Special Irish Branch unit of the London Metropolitan Police in 1883 to deal with the threat of Irish bombers, creating what historian Bernard Porter has called the “modern British State’s first official and regular secret political police force.” As Porter has pointed out, this in itself demonstrated a change in British attitudes, as the State and the public began to feel an anxious need for such an interventionist force after several decades of liberal attitudes against spies and secret police.66

By 1887 England’s secret political police was known simply as Special Branch, and it began to tackle threats beyond just those of Irish nationalists, eventually including a special focus on Anarchism. The officiality of this new secret police force and the press rumors of its activities added further credibility to sensationalist stories of secretive, illegal, and conspiratorial activities going on right under the nose of the English public. More generally, the Irish threat created a lingering fear of dynamite and subversive groups, and the negative stereotypes and attitudes the English possessed towards the Irish became a starting point for understanding the Anarchists in the 1890’s.

iii. REPORTS OF ANARCHIST VIOLENCE ON THE CONTINENT

While the Irish threat certainly lingered in the minds of the English, no doubt perpetuated by the Government’s failure to reach a compromise on the so-called “Irish Question” of Home Rule in the tumultuous 1880’s, Anarchist violence on the Continent in 1892 greatly magnified Anarchist fears at home. Reports on Anarchist activities in Spain gained wide circulation in England beginning in early January 1892. On 11 January 1892 the English papers reported that
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nearly 1,000 Anarchists, “armed with knives, scythes, and revolvers,” attacked the town hall and military barracks in Xerxes, Spain on 9 January. The rioters were reported to have cried out “Long live anarchy,” and their goal was said to be simply “plunder.” The reasons for such a violent and horrific Anarchist outrage, according to The Times, were two-fold. First, the recent spread of Anarchist propaganda in Spain had inspired “discontented and irresponsible people with nothing to lose” to shocking criminal behavior. Second, the Spanish government and its lax attitude toward Anarchism contributed to the scope of the outrage as the Spanish State had been aware of the Anarchist threat but had done nothing to stop it. Two months later the British press reported that a vast Anarchist bombing conspiracy had been unearthed in Spain. According to reports, the “diabolical plot” was discovered with the arrest of two Anarchists in Madrid who were “laden with bombs” and fought violently and desperately against the police. The Pall Mall Gazette insisted that the Anarchists’ plan to blow up the Chamber of Deputies was part of a much grander Anarchist conspiracy to bomb the National Law Courts, the Bank of Spain, the Senate, the Ministry of War, and the Royal Palace.

Individual Anarchists featured in the English press as well, including a Spanish Anarchist who burst into a church, decapitated the priest with a sword, and proceeded to shoot down many of the parishioners with his revolver. There was no reason given for the attack other than it was somehow connected to a suspected plot to assassinate the King of Spain. Perhaps the most scandalous report came on 25 April 1892 when British papers reported the seizure of vast quantities of Spanish Anarchist propaganda destined for the working masses. Among the
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67 See The Times, 11 January 1892. A similar series of articles reported Anarchist riots in Ronda, Spain and that the Spanish government had troops at the ready to fight. See the Aberdeen Journal, 22 January 1892.
68 See the Pall Mall Gazette, 5 April 1892.
69 See the Aberdeen Weekly Journal, 20 April 1892.
propaganda were some 30,000 leaflets printed with the “code of Anarchist laws,” which included the following key provisions:

(1) The first duty of a companion is absolute disregard of human life.
(2) He must recognize no law but that of the social revolution...
(4) Every Anarchist is obliged to defend his companions, at the peril of his life.
(7) No Anarchist can refuse to carry out any mission that may be entrusted to him...\textsuperscript{70}

Anarchist violence in France in 1892 was more extensive than that in Spain and gained even greater notoriety in England. Beginning in March 1892, Anarchists in France engaged in what became perhaps the most prevalent and destructive wave of ‘propaganda by the deed,’ and details and rumors of these events became almost daily headlines in England.\textsuperscript{71} Coinciding with the trial of the Walsall Anarchists, French Anarchists, dynamitards as they were popularly called, bombed the homes of government officials, military barracks, government buildings, and crowded public places. Many more bombs allegedly failed to go off or were discovered by the police. Reports of the French bombings spawned a frenzy of dramatic speculation about the true extent and danger of Anarchists. An article on 16 March, for example, asserted that the bombings in France were part of a vast Anarchist plot, organized by a central Anarchist committee in Belgium, and claimed that countless future attacks would be carried out by small, specially-trained, three-man gangs dispatched across the whole of Europe.\textsuperscript{72} Another report warned that Anarchists in Paris had seized massive quantities of dynamite and were preparing to systematically attack the homes and businesses of all foreigners living in France, especially the

\textsuperscript{70} For a reprint of the full code, see the \textit{Aberdeen Weekly Journal}, 25 April 1892.
\textsuperscript{71} This French bombing spree has been widely discussed by scholars of terrorism, with many arguing it is part of the birth of modern terrorism. See Walter Laquer’s \textit{Terrorism}, 1977; David C. Rappaport’s “The Four Waves of Modern Terrorism” in \textit{Current History}, 2001; Randall Law’s \textit{Terrorism: A History}, 2009; and John Merriman’s \textit{The Dynamite Club: How a Bombing in Fin-de-Siècle Paris Ignited the Age of Modern Terror}, 2009. For a discussion of the images that circulated in France around these events, see Annemarie Springer’s “Terrorism and Anarchy: Late 19th-Century Images of a Political Phenomenon in France” in \textit{Art Journal}, Summer 1979.
\textsuperscript{72} \textit{The Times}, 18 March 1892.
An editorial in *The Times* wrote of an ever-present sense of fear in France: “such outrages may be perpetrated at any time and at any place, and...the miscreants who cause them have every chance of escape.”

The reports from France often portrayed the power and elusiveness of the Anarchists versus the seeming helplessness of the French Government. An interview on Anarchism with the French Premier, Émile Loubet, in the French paper *Figaro* was widely reprinted across the British media. Loubet stressed both the perceived irrationality of the violence and the government’s lack of control: “Against such sudden catastrophes the detectives are hopeless. Prefects, Ministers, and even governments can do nothing, for all is incomprehensible...”

French shopkeepers reacted by allegedly hiring private guards and off-duty police to guard their shops around the clock from the Anarchist menace. Many French citizens called upon the French government to institute martial law. The French authorities reportedly utilized an extensive network of spies along with the police and employed the full use of the cavalry and *gendarmerie* to tide the threat of Anarchism. Perhaps most worrying to Britons, and especially Londoners, French authorities began to expel Anarchists from France by the end of March 1892. The English press roundly theorized that ejected French Anarchists were streaming into British cities where they could continue to operate without police interference, and reports asserted that many of them were congregating in Soho.
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73 *Aberdeen Weekly Journal*, 30 April 1892.
74 *The Times*, 28 March 1892.
75 See the excerpts reprinted in *The Times*, 29 April 1892.
76 *The Times*, 29 April 1892.
77 For example, see the report in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, 27 April 1892.
78 See the *Pall Mall Gazette*, 29 April 1892; and *The Times*, 30 April 1892.
Together, the Spanish and French Anarchist crimes of 1892 had numerous influences on the English reception to the Walsall Outrage. The flood of rumors and reports heightened the sense of an Anarchist presence throughout Europe, including England, despite the relative obscurity of Anarchism and the limited presence of Anarchists in England. The Continental news gave credence to theories of a European-wide Anarchist conspiracy, and, thus, validated the fear that European problems with Anarchism could become English problems as well. Some of the case details and the more sensationalist rumors relayed a common story of seemingly senseless violence, yielding the impression that Anarchists took joy in destroying the pillars of western civilization. European governments were portrayed as the only real defense against such a menace, yet European governments were also commonly seen as helpless in the face of Anarchism. Anarchist stories from the Continent, which spread quickly via newswire across the channel and into England, were reprinted in varying forms across the political spectrum of papers in England, overlapping and mingling with local stories and often becoming a strange hybridization of the two.

B. KEY EVENTS IN THE WALSALL OUTRAGE

In January 1892 Anarchism and explosives captivated the English public’s attention as rumors of Anarchist bombs and conspiracies emerged from Walsall in the West Midlands. The English press, which was undergoing spectacular growth and commercialization in the second half of the nineteenth century, focused much of its attention on the Walsall case, which unfolded over the next several months, and the new press agencies, such as Reuters, quickly spread a local issue in Walsall into a national panic through the rapid reprinting of articles across England's
regional and national presses. The Anarchist outrage in Walsall, which assumed larger-than-life proportions and fed on foreign and domestic hearsay, served as a public sphere that initiated a broad and decentralized discussion regarding Anarchism and its threat to English life. As a result, the popular press’ image of Anarchism began to eclipse the realities of the Anarchist movement, and the stereotype of Anarchism in England began to take shape.

The Walsall Outrage originated in the summer of 1891 in Walsall, an industrial and working-class town in the West Midlands of England. Walsall had a small but vibrant community of Socialists based loosely around the Walsall Socialist Club, and it had gradually become one of the few Anarchist hotspots in the West Midlands.80 The club was established just a few doors down from the local police station. This proximity to the police led to regular surveillance by the police who suspected and feared the club for its working-class radicalism. The six suspects in the case were minor figures within the Anarchist and Socialist community, and they were largely unacquainted before 1891. Englishman Joseph Deakin was a known Anarchist and the secretary of the Socialist Club. Victor Cailes was a French Anarchist who spoke little English and was in England as a political refugee.81 Frederick Charles, another Englishman, was a member of the very small paper, the Anarchist (Sheffield),82 and fellow Englishmen, William Ditchfield and John Westley, were both metal workers in Walsall and members of the Socialist Club. Finally, John Battola was an Italian Anarchist, who had immigrated to London and lived in Soho.

---

80 Walsall was the primary base for radical groups in the West Midlands – Chartism, Secularism, different strands of Socialism – and contained the only organized Anarchist presence in the West Midlands. See George J. Barnsby, Radical Walsall, 1990.
81 François Claudius Koenigstein, better known as Ravachol, claimed that his bombing campaign in 1892 in France was in revenge for the brutal treatment of some of the protesters of the Clichy riots by French police. See Jean Maitron, Ravachol et les Anarchistes, 1964.
82 For articles on Charles’ generosity, see Reynold’s News, 21 April 1895; and Anarchist (Sheffield), Vol. 2, No. 20, 1895.
The figure that tied the six Walsall suspects together was August Coulon, an Anarchist who was never arrested by the police in conjunction with the crimes. Coulon was an active and well-known Anarchist from France, and he communicated extensively with the international Anarchist community. After moving to London in 1890, he was a frequent contributor to many Anarchist publications in England and abroad, and he was known for his dogged advocacy of the use of dynamite, even making his living for a short while selling copies of a French manual, *L’Indicateur Anarchiste*, a how-to guide for the construction of bombs and the use of dynamite. Coulon befriended Deakin when they met at a Socialist club in London, and he introduced Cailes and Charles to the Walsall Socialist Club after assisting them in moving to Walsall and finding work. Battola, Coulon’s neighbor in London, sent the plan for the bomb to Cailes once he was residing in Walsall, and according to Deakin’s confession, building the Walsall Outrage bombs and utilizing local metalworkers in Walsall was Coulon’s idea.\(^{83}\)

Since the trial of the Walsall Anarchists, a plethora of rumors have insisted that Coulon was an *agent provocateur* employed by the British police to entrap Anarchists and discredit the Anarchist movement in Britain. Rumors of police spies and conspiracies had appeared with some regularity in England ever since the founding of London’s Special Irish Branch in 1883, and theories regarding Coulon no doubt fed into this tradition.\(^{84}\) More recently, Andrew Cook’s 2004 biography of Inspector William Melville of Special Branch, the lead inspector on the Walsall case and one of the inspirations for Joseph Conrad’s *The Secret Agent*, has shown that Coulon indeed worked for Melville in this capacity, and, thus, the rumors that the Walsall

\(^{83}\) See extended excerpts of the confession in *The Times* and the *Aberdeen Weekly Journal* issues of 22 January 1892.

\(^{84}\) Rumors of spies and *agent provocateurs* were fueled by the publication in 1885 of Louis Andrieux’s *Souvenir d’un Prefet de Police* (Memories of a Commissioner of Police). Andrieux, who helped to crush the Paris Commune in 1871, became Prefect of Police in Paris in 1879. In his autobiography, he suggested that he staged bombs in order to arrest and suppress Parisian radicals. The book became a popular rallying cry among Anarchists by the turn of the century who argued that the state was the real enemy of society. See Joseph Deakin’s own attack on the book in the Walsall Trial in *The Times*, 5 April 1892.
Outrage had been staged by the police may be true. There was significant discussion of Coulon as a possible Government agent in both the Anarchist and mainstream press, and while this did little to stem the fears of Anarchism, it became a point of pronounced criticism against the Government. Perhaps Coulon’s greatest importance in the Walsall Outrage, however, was the sense of mystery he gave to the case, and it was this air of mystery that allowed the press such wide leniency in interpreting and reporting on the case, as the Government was very reluctant to confirm or deny rumors or to present specific evidence.

i. THE EARLY WALSALL CASE: RUMORS OF A BOMB-MAKING CONSPIRACY

The Walsall case broke on 6 January 1892 when Detective-Inspector William Melville of Scotland Yard’s Special Branch arrested Joseph Deakin in London. Deakin was carrying a parcel with an unidentified bottle of white liquid, which was later claimed to be chloroform. Deakin had come from Walsall and was traveling to the Autonomie Club, an Anarchist gathering point in the East End. Deakin was charged under the Explosives Act of 1883, claiming that he was “concerned with other persons in having in their possession or under their control certain explosive substances under such circumstances as to give rise to reasonable suspicion that they did not have them in their possession or in their control for a lawful object.” Following Deakin’s hearing, Melville travelled immediately to Walsall and arrested Cailes, Charles, and Charles’ girlfriend at the Socialist Club and led a general search of the club. All three men were also charged with violating the Explosives Act.

85 See Andrew Cook, M:MI5’s First Spy Master, 2004. Cook’s analysis is convincing, but many of the records he was granted access to through his connections to the London authorities are not easily verified.
86 The Times, 14 January 1892.
A few days later Ditchfield and Westley were arrested in Walsall in connection with the case, and Battola was similarly arrested and charged in London, and all of their residences were searched. At the preliminary hearings before the magistrates in London and Walsall, Inspector Melville provided only a few obscure bits of evidence. He asserted that a mysterious liquid and an Anarchist publication were found on Deakin, a loaded revolver on Cailes, a mass of Anarchist literature seized at the Socialist Club in Walsall, and a metal bolt and cylinder found in the workshop of Ditchfield. Melville claimed that further inquiries were being made with the assistance of the Home Office and that in the interest of public safety all of the suspects, except for Charles’ girlfriend whom he vouched for, should be held without further evidence. All of the suspects were then brought to Walsall for a formal hearing.87

The first press reports were vague and often alarmist, working with the few facts provided by Melville at the initial hearings. *The Daily News* of 8 January was typical of the early reports. The paper alerted its readers that “…tonight the police at Walsall made some arrests which are believed to have an important bearing upon anarchical designs not yet discovered.” It further insisted that in searching the Socialist Club and the residences of the suspects and their friends, the police had made “discoveries of numerous articles, manufactured and unmanufactured, which warrant the authorities in saying that they have unearthed a well-concocted conspiracy for the preparation of bombs of the most dangerous character.” *The Daily News* of 8-10 January 1892.

---

87 Most of the relevant Government documents relating to the case were allegedly destroyed in subsequent years. The best sources for details of the arrests can be found in D.J. Nicholl’s *The Walsall Anarchists*, 1894; John Quail’s *The Slow Burning Fuse: The Lost History of the British Anarchists*, 1978; and in the trial reports from the English papers, especially the *Pall Mall Gazette*, *The Yorkshire Herald*, *The Times*, and *The Birmingham Daily Post* of 8-10 January 1892. Nicholl’s work has to be read with some caution, however, as he was an active defendant of the Walsall suspects at the time. He organized protests and raised money for their defense and was arrested himself by the police in London in 1892 for material he printed as editor of the anarchist journal, the *Commonweal*. The case of Marie Piblène is interesting as it is unknown why Melville vouched for her and had her released from custody, as trial reports only indicate that he presented this material to the judge in private. It is conceivable that if Coulon was indeed a paid spy, Melville may have also recruited Piblène. On the other hand, throughout all of the Anarchist outrages in England discussed in this study there was a dismissive attitude towards any women connected to the affair, implying that they could not be conspirators themselves.
News highlighted the dangerous character of the suspects, insisting that Charles was found carrying a loaded revolver and shells, “but he was collared before he had an opportunity of using it.” The Pall Mall Gazette echoed these claims, asserting that the police had uncovered a “conspiracy of the most determined and dangerous character.” The article went on to insist that the Walsall case must pose a national peril, given the multiple branches of the Government involved, including the police and the Home Office.

The Yorkshire Herald of the following day published a sensationalist exposé on the case. The exposé alleged that all of the evidence gathered, such as the bolt and the cylinder, were clearly an indication that bombs were being manufactured in Walsall and that the discovery of Anarchist literature showed that the bombs were meant for “anarchical purposes.” Perhaps more significantly, the article speculated on the history of the French and Italian Anarchists arrested, particularly the French Anarchist, Cailes. The article insisted that Cailes was a prominent Anarchist from the Continent who had organized the violent May Day riots and was wanted by French police for incitement to “murder, pillage, and incendiarism.”

There were more reserved accounts, such as Reynolds’s Newspaper of 10 January, which pointed out that the evidence tying the suspects and the discoveries together was far from conclusive. However, most newspapers which questioned the accusations of the suspects or the legitimacy of the evidence also published in the same paper, and often in the very same article, confirmation of the rumors. The Birmingham Daily Post of 9 January was a good case in point. In an editorial on the Walsall case, the paper announced that current opinion in Birmingham doubted the charges and the notion of a vast conspiracy. The editor noted that most

---

88 The Daily News, 8 January 1892.
89 Pall Mall Gazette, 8 January 1892.
90 The Yorkshire Herald, 9 January 1892.
91 Reynolds’s Newspaper, 10 January 1892.
people in Birmingham felt that “the arrests in Birmingham would only reveal the existence of a mare’s nest,” referring to the nineteenth century literary phrase for an illusory discovery. In an article on the following page, however, a reporter assured the readers that “it appears that there has existed for some years at Walsall a nest of true anarchists.”\(^92\) In sum, even with some reservations, press accounts presented a relatively unified view that a dangerous Anarchist conspiracy had been uncovered.

The immediate and sensationalist media coverage by the British presses reflected both the popular memory and the fear of the Irish bombs and the contemporary Anarchist violence on the Continent. Accusations of bomb-making and secret conspiracies brought to mind the established English anxiety over explosives propagated by the Fenian use of bombs, and the contemporary reports of Anarchist atrocities being committed in Spain gave some validity to the Walsall rumors. The English press was able to build upon pre-existing fears of bombs and political extremists, and those fears seemed all the greater and more realistic because of foreign events. Newspapers in England, circulating rumors of the domestic Walsall Anarchist conspiracy, printed and reprinted articles from foreign correspondents, press associations, foreign papers, and other British newspapers. These stories tended to be wildly speculative, sometimes printing credible information alongside the most sensational rumors and presenting them equally as facts. The events on the Continent were often combined or overlapped with the coverage of the Walsall case. For example, on 11 January 1892, when *The Times* described the large Anarchist attack in Xerxes, Spain, the attack was said to be for the purpose of raising funds for Anarchist schemes like that discovered in Walsall.\(^93\) Such stories made a clear link in the public mind between the

\(^{92}\) *Birmingham Daily Post*, 9 January 1892.

\(^{93}\) *The Times*, 11 January 1892.
Walsall Outrage and the Continental outrages, convincing the British nation that the Walsall Outrage was simply the English branch of a much wider threat.

The Walsall suspects were united for the first time in Walsall on 15 January 1892. The prosecution, led by Alfred Young, confirmed the conspiracy theory that had been ruminating in the press. He insisted that the suspects should be remanded for another week because authorities in Walsall and London had received “important information relating to a widespread anarchist conspiracy throughout the country.” The police provided evidence from the searches that seemed to suggest the dangerous character of the Anarchist suspects. Aside from the loader revolver with which Charles was arrested, at Charles’ residence police found a length of fuse, a model for a bolt that went on the top of a bomb, a sketch for a bomb, and instructions in French on how to make the explosive. The constables also discovered in the Socialist Club a quantity of clay mixed with hair allegedly for molding purposes, as well as a manifesto in French, allegedly in Cailès’ handwriting, titled “The Means of Emancipation” which concluded:

Let us occupy ourselves with chemistry, and let us manufacture promptly bombs, dynamite, and other explosive matters much more efficacious than guns and barricades to bring about the destruction of the actual state of things, and, above all, to spare the precious blood of our comrades. Courage, companions! Long Live Anarchy! Walsall, September 1, 1891.  

In Cailès’ apartment the police found many Anarchist papers and publications in French, including the International (No. 7) in French with instructions on building bombs and how to use them to destroy public buildings. At Ditchfield’s workshop the police seized a plaster cast of a bomb similar to the one in the sketch found at Charles’ apartment. The prosecution again remained vague. Young insisted that a great deal more evidence existed but that giving further details was “not in the public interest.” The suspects were again remanded without bail until the

---

94 The Times, 16 January 1892.
full hearing resumed a few days later, despite the defense attorney’s objection to the judge that his client was being held on a “charge of the flimsiest and most makeshift character.”

When the hearing resumed from 21 January into early February, the prosecution finally presented the bulk of its case. The prosecutor laid out the same discoveries presented at the previous hearings, including the mysterious liquid, the bolt, the metal sphere, and the hair/clay mixture, and stated that if these items were for a lawful purpose, they would be “the easiest thing in the world to explain.” A series of expert witnesses took the stand for the prosecution, from police who testified on the dangerous nature of the Socialist Club in Walsall to an explosives expert for Her Majesty’s Artillery, who asserted that the pieces in question could conceivably be used to fashion an explosive device. Melville also testified that he had had the suspects under surveillance since October 1891 and only arrested the men once he was sure of their destructive designs. The prosecution called several civilian residents of Walsall to testify that they had seen two or more of the men together, attempting to prove a link between the suspects. The State’s case still appeared to many as rather weak, until the prosecutor announced that he had obtained a full and damning confession from one of the suspects, Joseph Deakin.

ii. THE LATTER WALSALL CASE: AN EXPLOSION OF ANARCHISM AND VIOLENCE

Deakin apparently wrote a lengthy confession on the night of 15 January, although Deakin claimed that he had only confessed under threat from Inspector Melville and because he had realized that there was a spy in their midst. The confession, read in full in court, alleged that
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95 Ibid.
96 The Times, 22 January, 1892.
the men were brought together by August Coulon in October 1891 and that Deakin had heard
rumors of bombs for Russia or Prussia but refused to have anything to do with such an activity.
Deakin insisted that Coulon had convinced Battola to create a sketch for a bomb saying that it
would assist the poor people of Russia in their fight against their autocratic Tsar. He also
averred that Coulon had arranged the contacts between the Walsall Anarchists and that Coulon
had involved the Anarchist metalworkers who built the necessary components, although these
men knew little of what was going on.97 Deakin’s confession aided the prosecution by linking
together the various suspects and seemingly random bits of evidence with the Anarchist bomb-
making conspiracy the press had been reporting on. The defense objected that the case was
clearly a police set up arranged by Melville and Coulon, and after Melville was cross-examined
about Coulon, whom he claimed to have met but would not directly answer anything further, the
judge declared that he would allow no more discussion on the matter.98

The Walsall case took a very different turn after Deakin’s confession; it focused less on
discussions of bolts, metal cylinders, and sketches of bombs and transitioned to lengthy and
rather dramatic discussions on the threat of Anarchism more generally. The prosecution
introduced a litany of Anarchist publications and writings seized from the suspects, most notably
a manifesto signed by Cailes, a copy of the French pamphlet, “An Anarchist Feast at the Opera,”
an article from Le Tribune Libre, titled “Le Justiciers,” and an article from the English
Commonweal found on Deakin. The Commonweal article, for example, asserted that Anarchists
should “avow open sympathy with the robber and burglar,” and the prosecutor insisted that

97 Ibid.
98 See accounts of the confession and objections in The Times, 22; The Times, January 1892; The Illustrated Police
News, 23 January 1892; and The Times, 10 February 1892.
“every right-minded man must recognize it to be a document which propagated the most fiendish ideas.”99

Cailes’ manifesto was entitled “The Means of Emancipation,” and he denied writing it, constantly asserting that the whole affair was a “fiction of the police.” Nonetheless, Cailes’ manifesto called for violently bringing down the social order; it stated, “Let us occupy ourselves with chemistry, and let us manufacture promptly bombs, dynamite and other explosive barricades to bring the revolution of the actual state of things, and, above all, to spare the precious blood of our comrades.” The pamphlet “Anarchist Feast at the Opera” caused a particular stir with its inflammatory and violent rhetoric which advocated the burning of theaters with their audiences inside them. The writer discussed the joy of hearing the fizzling, crackling sounds of burning flesh and the screams of the victims and described the “delicious” taste of the burning flesh of the rich. In a similar vein, “Les Justiciers” discussed the execution of all those who perpetrated wrong in the world – the police, the “tyrants” in France and Russia, and the middle class.100 These works and their use in court effectively intertwined the scattered details of the case to the violent Anarchist rhetoric of ‘propaganda by the deed,’ and these works were taken both in court and in the public media to be the statements of the defendants themselves. The trial was set for the end of March, and the prisoners were remanded to jail until then.

The hearing after Deakin’s confession changed reactions to the Walsall case in several ways. The pamphlets read aloud in court were reprinted en masse in the press; thus, for a time, most papers in England were filled with examples of extreme and radical Anarchist language. The emphasis in the press shifted away from the details of the case to analyses and discussions on the threat of Anarchism more generally, especially on the role of extremist Anarchist

---

99 See Young’s quote in The Times, 22 January 1892; and a fuller discussion of the publications in The Times, 5 February 1892.
100 See The Times of 30 January 1892 and 5 February 1892.
propaganda. The suspects themselves, now tied to the violent rhetoric in court, came under speculative scrutiny. The press printed investigations and rumors about the backgrounds of the men, seeking to explain how and why they held such alarming views. Race came into play in these reports, as the press tended to downplay the role of the English suspects and greatly magnified the image of the French defendant Cailes.

However, the trial also engendered some sympathy for the suspects, particularly the English defendants. The vague evidence and sketchy expert witness testimonies were the source of regular jokes and criticisms of the Government and the police. The hearing was filled with accusations of a Government conspiracy, even after the judge had banned such talk. The papers reported regular outbursts from the gallery, such as one claiming that during testimony a man yelled, “…any suspicious element in this case had been the work of a man named Coulon, who was paid by the police…”, which was followed by cheers and howls from the gallery and the defendants.101 The Walsall suspects also complained about their extended incarceration and poor treatment in jail, and details of their suffering were widely reported along with criticisms of the Government’s handling of the case.102

Perhaps most importantly, following Deakin’s confession in court, rumors of Anarchists, both foreign and domestic, dramatically increased in the press. The flood of rumors tended to be especially vague and highly sensationalized, and the emphasis on widespread conspiracies seemed to reflect the supposed confirmation of a conspiracy in Deakin’s confession. The case of Joseph Cavargna in early February was illustrative of the tendency for vague and alarmist reactions. Cavargna was an insurance salesman in the Handsworth district of Birmingham, an area known at the time for its concentration of both immigrants and Socialists. On 5 February

101 The Times, 10 February 1892.
102 See for example, the report in the Birmingham Daily Post, 5 February 1892.
1892 Cavargna was arrested under the charge of “having explosives in his possession.” The weekend papers presented lurid stories about Cavargna’s Socialist and “probably” Anarchist connections because of where he lived. The press also surmised that he was manufacturing bombs for a mass crusade of violence across England and that Inspector Melville himself had kept him under strict surveillance. By Monday police released further evidence on the case. It turned out that Cavargna was also an inventor and had filed a patent for a new rabbit exterminator designed to ease the rampant pest problem in the Australian colonies. He had no explosives in his possession, but he had several prototype metal casings that were designed to hold gunpowder that would kill rabbits in their nests. Although the police released him, the *Pall Mall Gazette* warned that his story was suspicious and suggested that the police should continue to monitor him.103 By February 1892, bombs were allegedly cropping up all over England.

While the mainstream press displayed occasional sympathy for the English suspects, the Anarchist press and several prominent Anarchists embraced the cause of the Walsall men as both persecuted individuals and as a defense of Anarchism in general. The Anarchist newspaper, the *Commonweal* became a daily advocate for the defendants, even changing its name for a time to the *Walsall Anarchist*. Support for the Walsall defendants was bolstered by John McCormack, who was arrested in Birmingham and charged on 9 February with being drunk and disorderly. At his hearing McCormack told the judge that he was an Anarchist spy in the employment of Scotland Yard and the Walsall police and that he was responsible for “getting up evidence.” He further testified that inspector Melville could vouch for him.104 McCormack made matters worse
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103 See *Reynold’s Newspaper*, 7 February 1892; and *Pall Mall Gazette*, 8 February 1892.
104 *Birmingham Daily Post*, 10 February 1892.
for Melville when he sold his story to *The Birmingham Daily Argus*, which published the sordid tale, “The Adventures of a Police Spy” on 16 February.\(^{105}\)

Anarchists from across England and even Anarchists from the Continent converged on Walsall and ran marches and propaganda in support of the suspects from 25 February through the end of the trial.\(^{106}\) While this campaign led to mainstream discussions of individual liberties and civil rights, it had a far greater effect in bringing the English Anarchist community, their organizations and representatives, into view, magnifying the scale of the perceived Anarchist threat and seemingly confirming the press rumors of both national and international organization within the Anarchist movement.

By the time the full trial commenced on 30 March, the British public was in a bomb-fearing frenzy from the surge of reports of Anarchist bombings in France. Presided over by Justice Hawkins, already known as “Hangman Hawkins” for his draconian attitudes towards criminals, the trial became a foregone conclusion. Instead of a weighing of the evidence it functioned as a State-led exposition on the dangers of Anarchism at home and abroad. Electricians and explosives experts were called in to demonstrate how Anarchists could take simple and common-looking containers and construct bombs out of them.\(^{107}\) A great deal of effort by the prosecution and police was put into demonstrating that the materials found could indeed produce a working bomb. Although the police built several prototypes, they were never able to actually build a working model, and there was often confusion in court as to whether pieces of evidence were things seized from the suspects or built after the fact by the police.

---

\(^{105}\) *The Birmingham Daily Argus*, 16 February 1892.

\(^{106}\) The Anarchist campaign to support the suspects is detailed by one of its leaders, David Nicholl, in his short book, *The Walsall Anarchists: Trapped by the Police: The Truth About the Walsall Plot*, 1892.

\(^{107}\) This was a source of particular discussion, as newspapers widely discussed reports that a bomb in Paris in late March at 136 Boulevard St. Germaine was built into a common cooking pot and concealed under a woman’s dress. Thus, the papers often came to the conclusion that Anarchists were a particularly hidden threat. See the account in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, 4 April 1892.
Inspector Melville took the stand for extended periods to denounce the dangerous character of the suspects, the Walsall Socialist Club, and Anarchists more generally. Handwriting experts were brought in to testify that one of the inflammatory and violent writings seized by the police was written by the Cailes. However, most of the trial simply rehashed the Anarchist literature seized by the police, and rather long documents, such as “The Anarchist Feast at the Opera,” were read in their entirety in the trial. These works were again presented as the views of the suspects and as an explanation for any suspicious activities or materials by and on the Walsall men.

In conclusion, the Walsall suspects were tried for being Anarchists, although the judge denied this as he announced the verdicts: “The learned Judge, in passing sentence, declared that no one must suppose that any part of the sentence he passed was because they were Anarchist or because of the possession of those documents. The crime he had to punish was the crime now proved against them, of being in the possession of bombs to be used for the destruction of human life and property.” However, even in his closing statements to the jury when instructing them to go and deliberate on the case, Judge Hawkins himself read out excerpts from the seized pamphlet “The Executioners,” clearly linking these inflammatory documents as key evidence in the guilt of the suspects.

The jury returned after less than two hours to declare Deakin, Charles, Cailes and Battola guilty, while Westley and Ditchfield were found not guilty. Justice Hawkins sentenced Charles, Cailes and Battola to ten years of penal servitude, and Deakin was given five years penal

---

108 A large portion of “The Anarchist Feast at the Opera” is reprinted in W.C. Hart’s *Confessions of an Anarchist*, 1906, pp. 139-46.
109 *The Times*, 5 April 1892.
servitude in light of his confession.\textsuperscript{110} What had begun with mysterious arrests and vague evidence in January had transformed into a media frenzy by April, fed and sustained, in part, by the press reports of Anarchist violence on the Continent. The fear and insecurity initiated by rumors of Anarchist conspiracies and bombs in England were sustained for months by international news, domestic speculation, and the lengthy public hearings and trial of the Walsall Anarchists. This intense public focus led to exhaustive and critical public debates in both the daily press and the periodicals on the danger and character of Anarchism in England and abroad – debates that would linger in the public memory for decades to come.

C. THE EMERGENCE OF THE ANARCHIST STEREOTYPE IN THE BRITISH PUBLIC SPHERE

At the start of the Walsall Outrage very little was known about Anarchism in England, and very few Anarchists existed in England to constitute much of a public presence. With the Walsall Outrage, Anarchism arrived in England with startling force, and it fed on a particular source of fear in late-Victorian England – a fear of the unknown. In a struggle to make sense of the alleged Anarchist plot on the home front, the British press turned to the many pre-existing fears of the age to explain, order, and rationalize the newly discovered Anarchist danger.

There was little to contest the rumors that sprang up in the press in response to the Walsall Outrage. Most of the British public’s engagement with Anarchism, therefore, came in the form of sensationalized stories, reactionary analysis, and lurid images of Anarchists as inhuman creatures. These rumors seemed to be confirmed by the real, albeit small, Anarchist

\textsuperscript{110} See the extensive summation of the trial, evidence, and verdicts in the many articles that appeared in \textit{The Times}, 5 April 1892.
presence that emerged on the streets of Walsall and London amid the case. Anarchists in England took to the streets, joined by a few sympathizers from the Continent, to protest the arrest, trial, and harsh sentences passed against some of the Walsall suspects. One protest march in London, staged during a funeral conducted by the publisher of the Anarchist paper *Commonweal*, elicited a brass band, some twenty Anarchist banners, and a reported “thousands” of Anarchists. The march was monitored closely by a large police contingent, and the papers commented on the many languages spoken by the Anarchists in attendance. Newspaper articles utilized the numerous foreign languages and the large police presence to signify that Anarchism involved foreigners and that it was a significant threat to the State.  

Anarchist newspapers had a very limited circulation in England in 1892, but they came to a certain prominence through the spotlight on the case. The most inflammatory selections from these papers were reprinted widely in the mainstream media as examples of the Anarchist danger. The *Commonweal*, in particular, bore widespread headlines when its editor, David Nicholl, and publisher, Charles Mowbray, were arrested for publishing a story condemning the harsh sentences doled out to the Walsall suspects following the trial. In his article, Nicholl asked whether those involved in the sentencing—namely Inspector Melville and Judge Hawkins—deserved to still be alive. The editor and publisher were sentenced to penal servitude, and the English press fed on the scandal for weeks. The emerging Anarchist presence during and immediately after the Walsall case confirmed and exacerbated the rumors in the public mind, suggesting that Anarchism in England was both vast and grave.

---

111 For accounts of the funeral demonstration and *Commonweal* arrests, see *Pall Mall Gazette*, 25 April 1892; and *The Times*, 25 April 1892.

112 For a reprint of the article that led to the arrest of Nicholl and Mowbray, see *The Times*, 28 April 1892. Nicholl’s own account of the affair can be found in John Quail’s *The Slow Burning Fuse: The Lost History of the British Anarchists*, 1992. Quail’s work also includes an extended discussion of Nicholl’s and Mobray’s involvement in the case and their arrest.
Figure 1. Anarchist Protest Leaflet Supporting the Walsall Outrage Suspects. This was an example of the leaflets passed out in support of the men accused of the Walsall crimes as Anarchist protests against the Walsall case went on for several years. Note the image of scale it gave to the English Anarchist movement. Courtesy of the Kate Sharpley Library.

i. THE BRITISH PUBLIC DECLARES ANARCHISM AN ILLEGITIMATE POLITICAL MOVEMENT

The most significant effect of the debates surrounding the Walsall Outrage was that Anarchism became detached from legitimate politics in the minds of the British public. The press roundly began to refer to Anarchism from the Walsall case forward as something other than politics. The Economist, for example, likened Anarchism to a religion, asserting that both shared a degree of irrationality as opposed to the logic of legitimate politics: “Anarchism is like an evil religion, and it is best treated as one - like Mormonism or Mohammedanism.”\textsuperscript{113} An article in The Illustrated Police News, etc. felt that even the name Anarchism implied more

\textsuperscript{113} Economist, 19 March 1892.
legitimacy than its adherents warranted. The article questioned whether the public should even bother calling them Anarchists, as these men were simply “criminals and assassins.”  

The ideology of Anarchists became a common topic in the British press after the Walsall Outrage. However, these articles typically had little to do with careful readings of the leading Anarchist theorists, such as Kropotkin and Bakunin, and, instead, simply echoed popular conceptions of Anarchism – conceptions that had been reverse engineered out of the reports of violence and the reprints of inflammatory documents circulating in the news. Anarchist ideology was dismissed as illegitimate because its arguments were seen as too extreme to be realistic. Based roughly around the notion of ‘propaganda by the deed,’ the press saw Anarchists as too violent and too eager to kill. According to the Speaker, the more Anarchism and its theories on violence were studied, “…the more certain are we that we have to do not with a true political movement, but with the spasmodic efforts of a small criminal order of men, soured, sulky, jealous, and conscious that they are ‘cornered.’”

As was often the fashion in nineteenth century England, many of these accounts blamed French Revolutionaries. The Contemporary Review argued that beginning in 1789 an oppositional defiance entered the ether of certain radical circles; these revolutionaries desired unrestrained behavior and that was the basis for their Jacobin ideology. The 1830 Revolutions, the writer noted, had nothing to do with fighting for rights; these Frenchmen wanted “unlawfulness.” Anarchists were the matured inheritors of the French revolutionary sensibility, displaying “…a certain delight in the mere defiance of authority, moral, social, or political, and the setting up of the individual impulse as the supreme guide of conduct.”

The Review of Reviews contend that Anarchist ideology was merely a “cloak,” something that was designed

---

114 The Illustrated Police News, etc., 21 May 1892.
115 Speaker, 9 April 1892, p.426.
to sound eloquent but functioned to hide criminal proclivities under the cover of politics. The author insisted that Anarchism’s rise was a criminal epidemic with no relation to politics, the type of government, or inequitable social conditions. Again harking back to the French Revolution, the article claimed that for over one hundred years, or a “centenary of terror,” there had been a class of men who were “impatient” to get whatever they wanted, whether it was money or power. As technology had advanced, so had the danger of these inpatient men who had morphed into bomb-yielding Anarchists: “Impatience, however, without explosives can only beat its head against the wall.”

With the invention of dynamite, the press perceived that these lawless men had become a threat, and Anarchism was the label that they used to justify their actions. Highlighting the crimes of Ravachol, a notorious French Anarchist who detonated three bombs in Paris in March of 1892, as an example of the typical Anarchist, one article averred that Ravachol was “a man who was first a libertine and then a murderer, and finally an Anarchist and assassin...” In other words, Anarchists began life as inheritors of the French Revolutionary spirit, and over time they found that criminality and finally Anarchism allowed them to exercise their violent passions.

Thus, in the public sphere of late Victorian era anxiety, violence and extremism became a way to understand the now visible English Anarchist movement and a reason to exclude Anarchists from the political realm.

The Anarchist movement was often confused with the broader Socialist movement, which already had a greater degree of notoriety in England. There was some logic to the confusion, as Anarchists and Socialists were formerly allies in the International Workingman’s Association until their split in 1872, and they continued to share many meeting halls around

---

118 Ibid.
England. In middle-class British minds both Socialism and Anarchism were simply worrying forms of working-class radicalism. Some in the press argued that there was a real demarcation between Socialists and Anarchists. One article on the “Labor Briareus” facing England and referencing the mythical Greek hundred-handed monster, argued that Socialism was composed of many groups and that most Socialists were at least “reputable radicals.” According to the article, the majority of socialists had real grievances against the social system, even if they were a bit misguided in their approaches to solving them. This contrasted with the “methodological madness” of the Anarchists. This difference could be seen, the author noted, in their leadership. The Socialists were led by “by men of the intelligence of Brousse, Guesde, Lafargue, and others.” Even if such men were radical, they had a keen grasp of the world and of the political situation and that was reflected in their ideology. The Anarchists, in contrast, were led by men of “the type of Ravachol, or with teaching of the Bakunin type which lies behind their purely predatory instincts and pursuits.” Unlike Socialists, Anarchists were marked by their lack of intelligence and understanding, exemplified by the “feckless imbeciles who were tried at Walsall” and displayed “aimless or fanatical savagery” instead of political acumen.\(^{119}\)

In the wake of the Walsall Outrage, English press reports claimed that Anarchists had wildly unrealistic claims and desires. In an editorial on the Walsall trial in early April, *The Times* reflected on the goals of Anarchism, based upon the documents read during the trial:

> The object of that system is fully disclosed on the face of the documents read during the trial, and it has been openly avowed, and even gloried in, by many of the audacious miscreants who support it. It is to annihilate civil society as it exists, to obliterate that environment of law, order, and property in which civilisation flourishes, without which no civilisation, however rude, has ever been

\(^{119}\) *Speaker*, 23 April 1892, pp. 483-484.
known, and which has never been weakened or impaired without a sure and speedy relapse into barbarism.\textsuperscript{120}

Many in the British public mirrored the belief held by \textit{The Times} – the Walsall Anarchists, and in turn all Anarchists, wanted a world that did not exist and, more to the point, could not exist. In a way reminiscent of Edmund Burke’s critique of the French Revolutionaries, Englanders contended that history had already demonstrated the absurdity of Anarchist beliefs and the peril imposed by Anarchist actions – the destruction of civilization. According to the press and the public, the goals advocated by the Anarchist movement were unrealistic and infeasible, and Anarchists employed the jargon of political revolution as a guise to conceal their selfish and criminal desires.

\textbf{ii. THE BRITISH PUBLIC PERCEIVES ANARCHISTS TO BE ABNORMAL AND AMORAL INDIVIDUALS}

While one thread of debate attacked the Anarchist ideology as illegitimate, an even larger discussion revolved around the innate character of Anarchists themselves. While the arguments took many forms and covered many supposed key traits, they all shared the belief that the inherently poor nature of Anarchists showed definitively that their motives were not political but were a reflection of their personal flaws. This idea embraced the prominent lines of thought traced back to the Social Darwinists, and particularly to Francis Galton, who coined the term “eugenics” in 1883 to pseudo-scientifically study the inherent desirability or, conversely, the

\textsuperscript{120} \textit{The Times}, 5 April 1892.
inherent inferiority of individuals.\textsuperscript{121} Galton’s work dovetailed with other emerging scientific fields, such as criminal anthropology pioneered by Cesare Lombroso in the 1870’s, which saw malignant behavior as an inherited trait.\textsuperscript{122} Building upon these currents of thought, the press began to understand Anarchism as a type or a breed of person, akin to a racial category, rather than as a political entity.

In a stark illustration of gendered attitudes in late Victorian Britain, a number of media outlets compared the seemingly unfathomable behavior of Anarchists to the behavior of women. The satirical magazine \textit{Funny Folks} featured the following poem in May 1892, following Anarchist demonstrations in London for the then convicted Walsall men:

\begin{quote}
\textbf{An Anarchist at Home}
You blow me up when I stay at home,
As a faithful spouse should do,
You blow me up when away I roam
To my club for an hour or two.
You blow me up when I’m dull and sad,
You blow me up when I’m bright;
You blow me up when no wine I’ve had,
You blow me up when I’m tight.
So doesn’t it, doesn’t it, strike you,
Though Anarchy now be rife,
That there lives no Anarchist like you,
On earth, O my darling wife!\textsuperscript{123}
\end{quote}

In the poem, the husband, like the English nation, was a rational and sound creature who was supposed to control his own destiny. The wife, however, like the Anarchist, was unpredictable, illogical, and prone to violent outbursts, disrupting the natural order of power. The author was appealing to Victorian middle-class male sensibilities that often sought to classify women’s

\textsuperscript{121} See Sir Francis Galton’s discussion on the topic in \textit{Inquiries into Human Faculty and its Development}, 1883. For an early history of Eugenics and its rise under Galton, see Daniel Kevles, \textit{In the name of Eugenics: Genetics and the Uses of Human Heredity}, 1995.
\textsuperscript{122} See especially Lombroso’s \textit{L'uomo Delinquente}, 1876. Also, for a discussion of the rise of criminal anthropology, its goals and methodologies, see Stephen J. Gould, \textit{The Mismeasure of Man}, 1981.
\textsuperscript{123} \textit{Funny Folks}, 21 May 1892.
health and psychological problems as an artifact of an irrational nature. Again the English turned to existing anxieties and biases to explain Anarchism, and this view of women as irrational actors certainly presaged later English reactions to the threat of the militant Women’s Suffragettes at the turn of the century.\textsuperscript{124}

Other reports asserted that Anarchists were simply miscreants who were defined by their extreme vanity and selfishness. \textit{The National Observer} rather comically insisted that, “A characteristic...of Latter-day Radicalism is an uncompromising silliness.” When the Anarchist type “...wants a thing, he wants it so badly that he won’t be reasonable till he gets it.”\textsuperscript{125} \textit{The Times} concurred with the selfishness of Anarchists but gave the matter far more gravitas in an editorial considering the sentences of the Walsall men,

The motives which inspire the preachers of this wild crusade against society, and their recruits, are not difficult to fathom. They profess to believe that from the ruins of the social fabric which the wisdom, the experience, and the toil of ages have laboriously built up, some new and better order of things will arise. Some of them not impossibly have really wrought themselves into a sort of half-faith in this crude and monstrous creed. But most of them plainly use it as a mere cloak under which to sate the vilest passions that fill the human heart. Hate, envy, the lust of plunder, and the lust of bloodshed are stamped on every line of the anarchist literature read at Walsall, and on every word of the confessions of Ravachol. It is to commonplace motives like these...inordinate vanity and overwhelming love of power, that the acts of the Anarchists may almost invariably be traced.\textsuperscript{126}

In this view, the Walsall Anarchists were not motivated to build bombs out of ideology; they had a pathological desire for blood, glory, and destruction which separated them from common men. Further, the link to the Anarchist Ravachol, who had successfully completed bombings in France and had boasted of his violent deeds, strengthened the claim that the Walsall men were vain

\textsuperscript{124} Also see the Poem “Heigho for Highgate!” in \textit{Judy: The London Sero-Comic Journal}, 25 May 1892, which demonstrated many of the same themes.
\textsuperscript{125} \textit{The National Observer}, 26 March 1892, pp.479-480.
\textsuperscript{126} \textit{The Times}, 5 April 1892.
savages and expanded the characterization of barbarism to include all Anarchists, regardless of nationality.

Anarchists were also accused of harboring intense feelings of envy and desire for personal gain. One such account appeared in *The Saturday Review of Politics, Science, Literature, and Art* in late April and a featured story about a young London Anarchist, Herman Riedel, aged fifteen. The reporter asserted that Riedel’s case had evaded public notice, but that Riedel’s example aided in explaining the attitudes and the motives of Anarchists everywhere. Riedel had appeared the week before in the Thames Police Court after “a very mild attempt” to commit suicide, slashing his arm with a knife and attempting to bleed out until he was discovered. In his suicide note, Riedel wrote,

> I am compelled to do this act. I will not live as a slave. I will live this day as my last. My motto is ‘Die as a free man.’ That is better than to live as a slave. Anarchy forbids slavery. I am not insane - O no! - but I do this act of suicide, for my brother is a saucy fellow who always wants his rights. Anarchists will seize in the revolution. Let all tyrannical blood flow. I die in the name and luck of Anarchy.

The reporter insisted that the boy was a typical Anarchist in style and thought but that he was young and inexperienced. His envy and hatred of his brother had guided his actions, and they would become disdain for the bourgeoisie once his inner nature matured. The boy, the article furthered, had sought to assuage his inner vanity through his truly selfish act: “nothing in this world [is] more malignant than vanity.” The article claimed that when the boy grew up, he would become like his hero, “Ravachol, in whom vanity is manifestly colossal” and whose exploits showed a disregard for humanity and a simple desire for money and notoriety.127

---

Other articles, such as the following one in *Funny Folks*, illustrated the petty and avaricious nature of common Anarchists. *Funny Folks* portrayed a conversation between two Englishmen regarding robberies that had been committed by Anarchists:

FIRST CIT. Heard about the burglary at Thompson’s? His house was broken into by Anarchists, and all his plate carried off.
SECOND CIT. Bother these Anarchists, I say. Why, only the other evening my wife had her purse stolen by a female Anarchist who sat beside her in a ‘bus.
FIRST CIT. Really, now! By-the-bye, you’d better warn your wife against a sunny-faced, swindling Anarchist who imposed upon my wife on Monday last. He gained admission to our hall on the pretence that he was a water-rate collector, and then made off with two umbrellas and an overcoat.
SECOND CIT. I won’t forget to tell Maria. But, hang it, it’s awful to think there’s so much crime - I mean, so much Anarchism in the world, isn’t it?  

In this example Anarchism was stripped of all philosophy and meaning; it had become simple and lowly theft. The British public perceived that the desire for wealth led Anarchists to steal, swindle, and cheat from all, and their greed was so irrational that they stole small and duplicate items if they came across them. Crime, a term devoid of political meaning, was conflated and equated with Anarchism itself. Women, the direct victims in the story, here became symbolic of the weakness and vulnerability of the public against the threat of Anarchism in England.

Cesare Lombroso, the pioneer of criminal anthropology in Italy who would turn much of his attention to the study of Anarchists in the 1890’s, was often invoked to scientifically rationalize the Anarchist as a breed apart.  

According to the *Speaker*, the Walsall case demonstrated the work of Lombroso:
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128 *Funny Folks*, 23 April 1892.  
129 Anarchists became a major source of concern in Italy by the 1870’s leading to a government anti-Anarchist drive from 1878-1879. This inspired Lombroso and other like-minded criminologists to study Anarchists using Lombrosian somatic classification schemes. See for example, Pasquale Penta, *Rare Anomalie di un Cranio Delinquente*, 1889; and Lombroso’s own *Gli Anarchici*, 1894. For a modern analysis of Lombroso and his contemporaries and the role of Anarchism in the rise of criminal anthropology in Italy, see Daniel Pick, “The Faces
Lombroso, the well-known criminologist, has depicted the varieties of persons who have sought to mask criminal instincts under political objects: Charles, Cailes, and Battola are among them...In inordinate vanity, love of excitement and idleness, and a desire to be mysterious and important personages in the eyes of their companions, are to be found...the motives for the plotting which has consigned them to prison...\(^{130}\)

The article averred that what had doomed the Walsall men and continued to threaten England was the Anarchist’s inner, evil nature. This inner nature may be exposed, however, by outward physical manifestations: “…the descriptions of even the physical characteristics of Ravachol and his associates are unpleasant references to those morbid characteristics and signs of degeneracy which writers of *l’anthropologie criminelle* have noted…” Science here played two roles. On the one hand it gave Anarchists the weapons to wreak mass havoc, but on the other hand it gave the public tools to understand, detect, and presumably even prevent such “creatures” from acting according to their nature.\(^{131}\)

The widespread notion that Anarchism was about dysfunctional character and not politics was perhaps most powerfully conveyed at the time through the many popular images that circulated widely in the press. The image below was a typical representation of Anarchists in England by the time of the Walsall trial in April 1892.

---

\(^{130}\) Speaker, 9 April, 1892, pp.425-426.

\(^{131}\) Ibid.
Figure 2. Typical Images of Anarchists During the Walsall Outrage – Example 1. An Anarchist was depicted planting a bomb and attempting to destroy the pillars of civilization. Review of Reviews, May 1892.

This image conveyed the Anarchist attempting to blow up the pillars of society – law, religion, and property – and symbolized the fearful and evil stereotype that Anarchists embodied in the popular press by the time of the trial. The figure was only partly human, a ghostly figure with a primitive and animalistic face that relayed a faint smile. He was cloaked rather shabbily, no doubt signifying his working-class background, in a cloak of “Anarchy,” which somewhat obscured his full form from the reader. Notably, “Anarchy” and not “Anarchism” labeled him, illustrating that his goal was destruction and lacked any sort of positive or political purpose.132

Again British public’s stereotype of Anarchists as an apolitical breed of man was evident in the illustration above; he was an evil creature, hidden by false words and phrases, bent on destroying society for his own pleasure.

The following image depicted the more clearly devil-like conception of Anarchists that became quite popular in the wake of the Walsall Outrage:

![Image of Anarchist as Devil](image)

**Figure 3. Typical Images of Anarchists During the Walsall Outrage – Example 2.** An Anarchist, portrayed as a devil, masqueraded as a member of the working-class and concealed his violent plot under the guise of political and social protest. *FUN*, 27 April 1892.

In this image the Anarchist was far less human, bearing bat-like wings, horns, a pointed tail, and satyr legs complete with cloven hooves – all signs proclaiming his evil nature. On the Anarchist’s face was a much more pronounced look of joy, particularly in the middle left depiction, as he watched the bodies being rendered apart by his explosion. His only sign of motive was the caption, “Treacherous Revenge,” reflecting the widespread concern in England that Anarchists were plotting attacks for May Day 1892 in revenge of the Anarchists who were
injured and arrested during the previous May Day demonstration in France. The Anarchist at the top of the image was leading the English working-classes in a revolt against law and order, and the workers’ apparent ignorance in following such a creature was reinforced by their poorly written signs, “DOWN W LORS AND PLEECE” (down with laws and police), “NO MORE SOPE & WORTER” (no more soap and water), and “GIVE HUS BLUD” (give us blood). The signs conveyed the English followers’ poverty, lack of moral discipline, and potential violence—all traits commonly associated with the poor urban masses in late nineteenth century England.

The workers in the image stood in contradistinction to two different representations of the middle-class State. One representation was respectable, genteel and ultimately safe, portrayed by the well-mannered policeman and the proper lady, depicted in the lower right. The other modality was illustrated by the shrewd politician or “Demagogue” (upper left) seen placating to the working-class maid, and his flirtations with her as an attractive female suggested that his political rhetoric may be serving his baser instincts. This image of the middle-class State, the “Demagogue,” was depicted as dangerous and ultimately fatal as both the politician and his audience were killed in the explosion. The working-class rabble that followed their ersatz hero, the Anarchist, in the end only played a part in their own tragic demise. The Anarchist devil, in fleeing the scene of carnage, returned to his everyday mask of working-class normality (middle right), barely distinguishable from the rabble he had just led. Ultimately, the Anarchist was stopped by the “proper” State, but it was annotated as an “Unexpected Encounter,” alluding perhaps to both the Anarchist’s vain surprise at being stopped and the State’s surprise at the sudden attack and the presence of the evil. A key feature of this cartoon was the difference between the English workers and the Anarchist, who although he resembled the workers on the

133 FUN, 27 April 1892, p. 181.
outside, was a fundamentally different creature underneath, a creature who lusted for carnage and concealed himself behind misguided political movements.

iii. IMMIGRANTS ARE LINKED TO ANARCHISM IN THE PUBLIC MIND

Some British presses took the difference between England’s working-classes and Anarchists a step further and explained the difference in racialized terms. *The Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science, and Art* humbly noted in regard to the sudden threat of Anarchism, “...though we are really a modest, we are also a truthful, people, and cannot but point out the intrinsic inferiority of foreigners when the occasion calls for the remark.” The article contended that all dangerous Anarchists, such as Cailles in Walsall or Ravachol in Paris, seemed to be foreign.\(^{134}\) Other reports were far grimmer, such as another article in *The Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art* that insisted that Anarchists were a particularly dangerous type of foreigner: “Ravachol, for instance, is obviously a man with a canine appetite for attention. But though one is a little more this and the other a little more that, they all belong to the common type of scoundrel fanatic. Such fellows have seldom been wanting to any religious or other movement of a revolutionary kind.” Thus, Anarchists were not political group but were instead a breed of violent men who throughout history had found pseudo-political outlets for their violence. Unlike articles which had made similar claims that Anarchists were merely violent men, this article asserted that violent men such as Anarchists were not as dangerous in England and that men from foreign countries posed greater danger: “The soil of this country has never grown him in full development...”\(^{135}\) The report contended that there may be flashes of the

\(^{134}\) *The Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science, and Art*, 19 March 1892, p.318.

\(^{135}\) *The Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science, and Art*, 9 April 1892, pp.407-408.
danger in the working-classes of England, in men such as Deakin and Ditchfield, but that their
dangerous growth was far more limited in England than in countries such as France and Russia.

Many debates focused on why Anarchists seemed to be foreign, and most concluded that
it was due to England’s respect for individual liberties, paying homage to the glories of
individualism and liberalism espoused in the mid-Victorian period. The Speaker pointed out that
Anarchists seemed to be “…strongest precisely where the development of free political
institutions has been most conspicuously delayed.” The article described how France, Italy, and
Russia each suffered some form of totalitarianism and limited local liberties which had led to the
development and the maturation of Anarchist fanatics over time. According to another article
in the Speaker, English workers had characters founded on liberty and freedom and the
concomitant traits that emanated from that political state: “We have no fear that men of the
stamp of Cailles and Battola will have any attraction even for a small portion of working-men.
Their good sense, if not their moral scruples, will save them from meddling with...the murderous
dilettantism connected therewith.” The Economist agreed, arguing that America and Britain
were protected by their respect for individual freedom:

Nothing can stop men who trust one another from colloguing together,
and plots hatched in the tap-room are more dangerous than plots
discussed in the square…must not eliminate liberties as many call for
because it is those liberties that keep Britain safe...evil opinions die in
the air, and that is better not to drive them violently inwards.

The author inferred a gulf between violent talk and violent action; with a respect for liberty
violent talk did not pose much public danger, but without a respect for liberty violent talk
invariably yielded violent action.
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Most arguments, nonetheless, assumed that however free and respectful of individual liberty England was, Anarchism was quickly becoming an English problem. An exposé in The Graphic, “The Anarchist at Play,” asserted that the line between English and foreign was blurring. In an East London street, the author noted, there was a boarding school full of those only “partly English” on one side and an Anarchist club on the other side “which face one another like cause and effect.” According to the article, foreigners were slowly breeding with the English poor, and their progeny were growing up to be of increasingly dangerous and foreign mindsets. As children, the progeny attended the boarding school where they learned from a young age to hate “capital,” and as they matured they crossed the street, transitioning from the boarding school to the Anarchist club. Throughout childhood, these children, who were a hybrid of English and foreign, heard Anarchist speeches, attended Anarchist dances, and played games with the children of other Anarchists until Anarchism became a part of their daily life and their normative behavior. By the time these children had become adults, according to the article, they were an ideal fit for the Anarchist club, no matter how much English blood ran through their veins.\textsuperscript{139}

D. CONCLUSION

The Walsall Outrage had several significant effects on the mindset of the English public. First and foremost, Anarchism became dramatically more visible in England, both in reality and in the public’s imagination. As an editorial from The Times commented, “The crime of which the Walsall prisoners have been found guilty was no isolated act. It is part of a great system with definite tenets and recognized apostles, with scores of active emissaries in every land, and

\textsuperscript{139} The Graphic, 30 July 1892.
hundreds of fanatical supporters in many busy centres of industry.” Following the Walsall case, there was a striking and sustained increase in reporting on Anarchist events both at home and abroad. Prominent newspapers by late-1892 and early-1893 had begun regular columns reporting on Anarchist news and rumors. *The Times* chronicled the violence of Anarchism in the simply titled column “The Anarchists,” while the *Daily News* published “Anarchism Abroad.” The *Pall Mall Gazette* wrote “Anarchism on the Continent,” and *The Northern Echo* regularly printed “The Anarchist Scare.”

As a result of the popularity of Anarchism in the British media, the public began to see signs of Anarchism everywhere; *Reynolds’s Newspaper*, for example, was one of several who began to label Lord Salisbury, the Conservative Prime Minister in early 1892, as an Anarchist for his advocacy of Ulsterman taking up arms against the specter of Home Rule: “…in these days of wild Anarchism Lord Salisbury, Prime Minister, Tory, and aristocrat, is found actually urging the Anarchist argument…” Anarchist bomb scares, accusations, and conspiracy theories became commonplace for the next several decades in England.

The Anarchist violence in Spain in 1892 and the French Anarchist wave of terror from 1892-1894 intensified fears of Anarchists during and after the Walsall Outrage. As reports of violent Anarchist crimes on the Continent poured into England via rapid news-wire and fed into Britain’s sensationalist new press, the lines between foreign and domestic Anarchist events blurred in the public mind, making the Walsall case seem not only more violent but also part of a grand and overwhelming Anarchist threat that transcended the community and the nation. Furthermore, press reports of Continental Anarchists, such as Ravachol, played a prominent role in the development of the early English stereotypes of Anarchism and its followers.

---
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Anarchists, in popular British opinion, emerged from the Walsall Outrage and its surrounding media frenzy as apolitical creatures. There were several reasons the British public depoliticized Anarchism in the wake of the Walsall Outrage. For some members of the English public, the ideology of Anarchism itself lacked rationality and coherence, save for the dynamite that now seemed to accompany it. Its followers could not be genuinely political because of their violence and extremism, which negated the rationality deemed necessary for political life. For other British citizens, Anarchism was merely the cloak of civility hiding truly menacing and hideous creatures that thrived on human pain and suffering and whose goals were only their own glorification and greed. While such evil creatures may have been bred through the tyranny of foreign governments and the inferiority of alien blood, after 1892 the general consensus of the British public was that Anarchism no longer maintained any legitimacy as a political movement.

The Walsall Outrage also set the precedent that monitoring Anarchists fell to the duty of the State. Secret State agencies, such as Special Branch and the Home Office, were very publicly involved with the Walsall case, and Government spies and spymasters, such as Coulon and Melville, were an integral part of the Walsall Outrage legacy. This connection between the State and Anarchism was furthered by the many comparisons between the Irish bombings and Anarchist violence. The Times published an extensive list of bombings ranging from 1881, the start of the five year Irish bombing spree, to the Walsall Outrage in 1892. While some of the bombings on the list were real and others were suspect, lacking verification or strong evidence, the clear message to the British public was that the Irish bombings had been tackled by the State and now Anarchist bombings must face the same fate.\(^{142}\)

In early 1893, the English Illustrated Magazine published a four-part series, titled “Hartmann the Anarchist; or, The Doom of the Great City.” The story described a futuristic

\(^{142}\) The Times, 5 April 1892.
London in 1920, and the narrative revolved around a grand conspiracy created by an Anarchist named Rudolph Hartmann. Hartmann hated the decadence and unfairness of the liberal and capitalist world around him, and he viewed London as the heart of this great evil. Hartmann created a new “silvery metal” that was incredibly strong yet very light, and he used it to build an airship whose mission was to raze London to the ground and unleash a chaos that would “regenerate” mankind. With a crew of hardened Anarchists, many of whom were identified as violent criminals and murderers, he attacked London from the air, dropping bombs and shooting down crowds of panicked civilians. Ultimately, London was left devastated and in flames.\footnote{\textit{English Illustrated Magazine}, June-September 1893.}

The story of “Hartmann the Anarchist” highlighted many of themes that arose out of the Walsall Outrage. Hartmann and his crew were unlike typical Englishmen; they gloried in violence and dreamt of destruction. Hartmann, despite his German influences, was very much English, and when he finally returned to England to destroy London, it signified to the British public that the threat of Anarchism had come home to roost. His compatriots were less complex figures who illustrated the emerging stereotype of Anarchists as evil and amoral individuals who enjoyed crime and destruction but attempted to mask it with the political doctrine of Anarchism. Hartmann attacked with a new “silvery metal” with astounding capabilities, and this metal, like dynamite, depicted the dangers of technology when in the hands of Anarchists.

As a result of the Walsall Outrage and its development into a spectacle that played out in the British press, the British public’s conception of Anarchism changed. The violent, dangerous, and destructive images and stereotypes of Anarchism depicted in “Hartmann the Anarchist” in 1893 were widely accepted and endorsed by the greater British public. These images, however, were far removed from days in late 1891 when the English public was sympathetic to a young Anarchist who had shot at the House of Commons, calling him a “young Byron” and describing...
his uncharacteristic generosity.\textsuperscript{144} The Walsall Outrage altered England’s understanding of Anarchism and changed the English mental landscape, and its effects would prove lasting.

\textsuperscript{144} See the \textit{Liverpool Mercury}, 1 Jan 1892; \textit{Reynolds’s Newspaper}, 3 January 1892; and \textit{Pall Mall Gazette}, 7 January 1892.
III.

THE ANARCHIST DISEASE: THE GREENWICH OUTRAGE, 1894

“We will not enter the controversial province of criminal pathology, although it seems certain that in the criminal deeds of the Anarchism of action a large share is taken by persons pathologically diseased or mentally affected.”


After the Greenwich Outrage in 1894, Englanders conceptualized Anarchism as a type of disease that could be inherited, caught, or even learned. The British public considered Anarchism to be the result of a biological abnormality or mental illness that produced violent, criminal, and amoral behavior and perpetuated a deep-seated desire for death and destruction within those afflicted. The disease model focused on the overwhelming vanity and selfishness of Anarchists as its core psychological feature. Anarchists were perceived as individuals who sought fame at any cost and thrived on death and the destruction of society, and this perception of Anarchists as diseased and mentally abnormal people became the way that turn of the century England understood and dismissed the motivations of Anarchists. Growing concerns over immigration became connected with the idea of an Anarchist disease, and in turn, Anarchism and its perceived biological attributes became indelibly linked with the issue of immigration reform. The bomb plot in Walsall had brought Anarchism to the public’s attention and had divorced it from any legitimate political meaning. However, it was the Greenwich Outrage in 1894 and the
subsequent perception of Anarchism as a disease that created the framework for the public’s understanding of Anarchism as a symptom of England’s problems, and it was upon this framework that the shift in British public opinion away from liberalism and toward an interventionist State began to take place.

A. ANARCHISM IN ENGLAND BETWEEN THE WALSALL AND THE GREENWICH OUTRAGES

Following the Walsall Outrage in early 1892, Anarchist bombings on the Continent continued as a regular fixture in the English press through 1894. Three Anarchists, two French and one Spanish, became notorious in England after their violent bombings struck at symbolic pillars of European civilization. Frenchman François Claudius Koenigstein, who was known to the public as Ravachol (1859-1892) and featured prominently in the media frenzy surrounding the Walsall Anarchists, made headlines when he bombed the houses of several Government officials in Paris in March 1892. Ravachol claimed that he was avenging the arrests and harsh sentencing of fellow Anarchists in Clichy the previous year. The Spaniard Paulino Pallas (1862-1893), in retaliation for the brutal military suppression of an Anarchist-inspired peasants' revolt in early 1892, threw two bombs into a military demonstration in Barcelona in September 1893. Auguste Vaillant (1861-1894), protesting the execution of Ravachol, threw a bomb into the middle of a parliamentary session in the French Chamber of Deputies in 1893. The press in

145 For a detailed account of Ravachol’s life and the cult following after his death, see Jean Maitron’s Ravachol et les anarchistes, 1964.
146 This peasants’ revolt took place in Jerez, in Spanish Andalusia, commonly known as Xerxes at the time. The most thorough accounts of Pallas’ bombing are found in George Richard Esenwein’s Anarchist Ideology and the Working-class Movement in Spain: 1868-1898, 1989, and Murray Bookchin’s The Spanish Anarchists: The Heroic Years 1868-1936, 1998.
England anxiously followed and analyzed the cases of these three foreign Anarchists, and for years the names Ravachol, Pallas, and Vaillant served as important talismans of violence and fanaticism in discussions of Anarchism in England.

The initial fascination with these three Anarchists no doubt reflected the brazen and symbolic nature of their attacks, but the events following the bombings played an even greater role in their cases becoming ill-famed in England. Each Anarchist had a public and widely followed trial where the Anarchist defendant behaved in a peculiar and shocking manner. Each of the men boasted that they were guilty, and they claimed to be very proud of the damage and the death they had inflicted. These three Anarchists gave long and vitriolic speeches on the stand, denouncing Western society and denying the legitimacy of the judges and juries. Showing no remorse or fear of death or of harm to themselves, these vociferous Anarchists threatened the people present in the courtroom and promised that others would avenge their deaths and kill many more.147

Ravachol, Pallas, and Vaillant were each summarily executed, and their courtroom threats soon appeared prophetic. Ravachol’s execution was avenged by Vaillant’s bomb in the French Chamber of Deputies, and Pallas’ execution was protested by Santiago Salvador Franch, who threw two bombs into the Opera del Liceo in Barcelona during a performance in late 1894. Several additional Anarchists claimed to retaliate against Vaillant’s death, including Émile Henry’s café bombing in Paris in February 1894 and Santo Caserio’s assassination of French President Sadi Carnot in June 1894.

A certain mystique built around Ravachol, Pallas, and Vaillant. In some Anarchist circles they became martyrs and heroes to the cause. Ravachol, for example, was celebrated in Anarchist publications across Europe and America, and songs, such as *la Ravachole*, were sung at Anarchist meetings. Vaillant’s grave in France became a shrine and a site of pilgrimage for many Anarchists, and the French authorities were often reported to fend off crowds at the memorial site. Such celebrity attracted public scorn: according to *Reynold’s Newspaper*, “It is difficult to understand the perversion of the human mind which can see a hero in a profligate, thief and common murderer like Ravachol or the madman Vaillant...” To the broader British public, however, these Anarchists appeared as particularly dangerous, violent, and sadistic individuals and alarming visions of the specter of Anarchy.

The cases of Ravachol, Pallas, and Vaillant kept the fear of Anarchists alive in England. The Walsall Outrage had opened British eyes to Anarchism, but the vivid representations and diatribes of these three bombers maintained the public’s intense focus on Anarchism for the next two years. The media scrutiny of these particular men – the wholly destructive nature of their crimes, their fiery rhetoric in court, their celebration of carnage, and the brutal reciprocity for their deaths – created a strong and lasting association in the British press between Anarchists and wanton violence. Furthermore, as these men were deemed highly abnormal, this extreme violence was attributed to something inherent about the physical and mental nature of these individuals.

---

148 *La Ravachole* was sung to the tune of to the tune of the popular French song, *la Carmagnole*. The *Pall Mall Gazette* denounced the “hero worship” at Vaillant’s grave in a feature article on 2 March 1894. A copy of *la Ravachole* can be found at [http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/ravachol/la-ravachole.htm](http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/ravachol/la-ravachole.htm). Numerous contemporary works celebrate the lives and actions of Ravachol, Pallas, and Vaillant. A good description of several of these can be found in Ernest Alfred Vizetelly, *The Anarchists: Their Faith and Their Record*, 1911. The best scholarly discussion of the psychology and fascination with Anarchist martyrdom can be found in John Merriman’s analysis of French Anarchist *dynamitaard* Emile Henry in *The Dynamite Club: How a Bombing in Fin-de-Siècle Paris Ignited the Age of Modern Terror*, 2009.

149 *Reynold’s Newspaper*, 17 December 1893.
English attitudes toward Anarchist violence following Walsall still posited that Anarchism was primarily a Continental problem, and the rash of bombings from 1892-1894 in France and Spain certainly reinforced this notion. As the Leeds Mercury reported in December 1893, “The air is full of dynamite, gun-powder, picric acid, gelignite, nitro-glycerine, and prussiate of soda, and the Anarchists are flinging their shells, or their cartridges, about all over Europe.” Many reports averred that because of English free-speech and the ability to “let off steam” among the poorer classes, England was “...less seriously troubled with these Anarchist gentlemen than any other nation in the world.” However, a fear began to emerge that England might not be immune to such terror. Beginning with the French expulsions of Anarchists in 1892 and similar reports of Italian and German Anarchist diasporas, many newspaper reports insisted that dangerous Continental Anarchists were migrating to London, seeking refuge in areas, such as Soho, where several Anarchist clubs existed with largely foreign memberships.

This statement in The Times following a French Anarchist bombing in April 1892 is characteristic of reports throughout the period:

…professed Anarchists of various nationalities, well known to the police in their own countries, have arrived in London during the past few days, doubtless to escape arrest. Some of these, it is suspected, arranged before their departure for the carrying out by subordinates of the explosion at Véry’s Restaurant, in Paris, on Monday night, as there were fresh arrivals from the French capital yesterday.

Police and media scrutiny of English-based Anarchist publications enhanced the fear that Anarchists were out for English blood. The Commonweal, an Anarchist weekly published out of London, became a leading organ for the cause of the Walsall Outrage suspects. After their

150 Leeds Mercury, 16 December 1893. All of the items listed were formulations or key ingredients for explosive devices at the time.
151 Speaker, 18 November 1893, p.544-546.
152 The Times, 27 April 1892. Similar worries cropped up in Government circles as members of Parliament often cited the press rumors as evidence. See H. o C. Debate, Hansards, 22 December 1893.
sentencing, the periodical published several articles denouncing the verdicts and advocated violence in retaliation for the convicted Walsall Anarchists. In one article of note, the editor warned:

Hunt us down like mad dogs. Strangle us like you have done our comrades in Xerxes. Shoot us down as you did the strikers at Fourmies, and then be surprised if your houses are shattered with dynamite...Perhaps, too, it will be just when the oppressed strike back at you without ruth, and without mercy. Only don’t whine for pity in those days, for it will be useless.153

The Commonweal was eventually shut down, and its editor and publisher were convicted of incitement to violence. The attention the affair was given in the mainstream press, however, conveyed the notion that violent Anarchist ideas were simmering in England. The popular media expressed concern that Anarchist rhetoric could delude the poor, the unemployed, and the listless with false promises and make violent Anarchists out of them. As one report noted, “Anarchist and revolutionary sheets have been multiplying, deluding working men by their chimerical promises.”154

By the start of 1894 in England, Anarchism was synonymous with violence and malignant persons on the Continent, and fears that England could fall victim to violent, foreign Anarchists were circulating. The fear of Continental Anarchist violence landing in Britain was realized by an attempted bombing at the Greenwich Royal Observatory by a French Anarchist in 1894. The Greenwich Observatory bombing, known as the Greenwich Outrage, brought Anarchist violence, or at least the perception of that violence, home to England; Anarchism was no longer only a Continental problem.

153 The article was widely and repeatedly reprinted in many papers. See, for example, The Times, 28 April 1892.
154 The Times, 14 December 1893.
B. KEY EVENTS IN THE GREENWICH OUTRAGE

When the Greenwich Outrage occurred in early February 1894, the English were closely following French Anarchist affairs. Vaillant had been publicly executed on 6 February, and his death had been avenged when Émile Henry threw a bomb into a crowded café in Paris on 12 February. Only three days later, the Anarchist violence that had been scorned in the English press for the previous two years erupted in London, the center of Britain’s political, economic, and cultural life. A French Anarchist bombing just outside of the Greenwich Royal Observatory in London confirmed the public’s rising fears that Anarchism and violence were inseparable.

The Greenwich Observatory was already a national symbol in the greater London area; founded by Charles II in 1675 to study astronomy for the aid of English ships, it had steadily grown in international repute culminating in 1884, when the Observatory was declared by an international agreement to be the Prime Meridian, or the center of world time. Thus, the explosion took on the added import of the site and came to be seen as an attack on the State itself. The extensive press coverage of the bombing and the subsequent events attempted to explain both who and, more importantly, what the bomber was. The English press began to regard Anarchism as a very menacing type of disease that infected individuals and threatened the life of the broader social body.

On 15 February, 1894, at 4:40 in the afternoon, a worker at Greenwich Park heard a thundering explosion near the Royal Observatory. The worker rushed up the path that led up the

155 The conference in 1884 in Washington D.C., which included delegates from twenty-five nations, in large part chose Greenwich as the Prime Meridian because most Western seamen already navigated and calculated based on Greenwich time, demonstrating the status Greenwich had already assumed by the 1880’s. Yet, the official designation in 1884 effectively replaced the previous practice, at least in the West, of local towns and villages setting their own time. See A. J. Meadows, Greenwich Observatory : The Story of Britain's Oldest Scientific Institution, the Royal Observatory at Greenwich and Herstmonceaux, 1675-1975, Vol. 2. Recent History (1836–1975), 1975.
hill to the observatory and came upon a gruesome scene. A young man, “respectably dressed,” was kneeling on the ground in a pool of blood that started several yards up the path, and blood and body parts were spattered on the railings and surrounding trees. The young man had severe punctures and wounds all over his body and face; part of his left arm had been completely severed, and his right sternum below the last rib had been torn open, spilling out his internal organs. The injured man reportedly said to the park worker, “Take me home,” but was unable to speak further. As more witnesses arrived on the scene, including a local doctor, an ambulance was called, and the man was taken to a nearby hospital. He died within a few minutes of arriving, and the doctors at the hospital expressed amazement that the young man had lived for any length of time beyond the explosion given his extensive injuries.\footnote{For a lengthy account of the explosion and the discovery of Bourdin, see \textit{The Weekly Dispatch}, 18 February 1894.}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image.png}
\caption{Boudin Discovered Outside the Greenwich Observatory. This image illustrated the discovery of Bourdin, badly injured from the explosion, with the Royal Greenwich Observatory in the background. \textit{The Graphic}, 24 Feb 1894.}
\end{figure}

Identification proved easy, as the young man carried a card that announced him as “Marial H. Bourdin, 18 Great Titchfield-street, Oxford-street.” He also carried a membership
card to the Autonomie Club, the already notorious Anarchist club located in London. He had several undated receipts for meals and hotel stays in various Continental cities, correspondence in French, and a substantial amount of money in his pockets. Allegedly, sown into the linings of his jacket, he carried a bottle containing mysterious white powder and recipes in Latin for “the most destructive explosives.”

The authorities had little indication of Bourdin’s plans and goals. There were no witnesses to the actual explosion, and Bourdin was not able to communicate any evidence before his death. Witnesses and police claimed that the physical features of Bourdin were “clearly foreign,” and the documents on his person “showed conclusively that he was an Anarchist.”

The police, under the direction of Scotland Yard’s Special Branch and its Chief Inspector William Melville, quickly marked off the scene and combed the surrounding woods, finding bits of flesh, bone, and glass but little else. The glass was assumed to be from a bottle, and it was concluded that “the deceased man fell and caused its contents to explode.” There was little to suggest whether Bourdin had carried a bomb or simply hazardous material, and other than his proximity to the Greenwich Observatory, there was no clear indication of whether he was engaged in a dangerous plot or simply involved in an accident. As The Bristol Mercury and Daily Post commented on the physical evidence, “their nature is shrouded in a kind of melodramatic obscurity.”

The police and the press conducted numerous interviews around Bourdin’s work and home and at the Autonomie Club where he held membership, but they, too, gave little evidence of motive or means. Henri Bourdin, his brother and occasional employer, in an interview with

---

157 Reynolds’s Weekly Newspaper, 18 February 1894.
158 The Graphic, 24 February 1894.
159 Ibid.
160 The Bristol Mercury and Daily Post, 19 February 1894.
The Weekly Dispatch, insisted that both he and Martial’s parents in France were shocked by the news. When asked if Martial was an Anarchist, Henri asserted that his brother was not even interested in politics. Henri claimed to know nothing about his bomb-related activities, but he admitted that Martial had acted very secretive lately and always had lots of papers with him that he refused to discuss.\textsuperscript{161} Martial’s landlord, Mr. Delebecq, said he knew little of his tenant, but that he regularly saw him hanging out with other “foreigners.”\textsuperscript{162}

Out of this slim evidence, the press seized upon several key identifiers that came to characterize Martial Bourdin and the bombing itself. First, Bourdin was French. Born in France, he immigrated to England in 1888, when he was twenty years old. Second, Boudin was an Anarchist, and his presence in England perpetuated the ongoing fear of particularly violent Continental Anarchists, such as Ravachol, Pallas, and Vaillant, immigrating into England. Third, he was connected to the Autonomie Club in London, which had come to public attention during the Walsall Outrage. The Autonomie Club had subsequently been a common target for speculation, including prevalent but sensationalist rumors that Ravachol and Vaillant were members and that the Club was the hub of Anarchism in Europe.\textsuperscript{163} Lastly, based on the predominance of English news reports bemoaning the flood of French Anarchists seeking asylum in England, Bourdin was widely assumed to be in England as a political refugee, despite evidence to contrary.\textsuperscript{164}

\textsuperscript{161}The Weekly Dispatch, 18 February 1894.

\textsuperscript{162}Reynolds’s Weekly Newspaper, 18 February1894.

\textsuperscript{163}The rumors were widespread enough that the House of Lords discussed them and the danger of the Autonomie Club in a debate on the proposed Aliens Bill on 17 July 1894. See especially the comments of Lord Halsbury in H. o L. Hansards, 17July 1984.

\textsuperscript{164}The notion that Martial Bourdin was a political refugee did not fit the details of his case. Martial Bourdin had moved to England in 1888, several years before Anarchists began fleeing France in any numbers. Second, his brother, Henri, had given a full account of Martial’s coming to England, which had begun under the pretext of improving his English and working in Henri’s tailoring shop, not fleeing political persecution. Lastly, there was never any credible evidence brought to light that Martial was involved with Anarchism before he came to London.
The connection between the Greenwich bombing and the Autonomie Club led the police
to raid the Club on 16 February 1894. The raid illustrated the growing sense, even among the
authorities, that Anarchism and its institutions within England were too dangerous to be ignored.
The raid provided few details of Bourdin: the members of the Autonomie Club insisted that he
was a little known member and that no one was aware of him advocating violence. However, the
raid magnified the public perception that Anarchist violence of the type seen in France was also
present in England. The Government’s intervention in Anarchist affairs intensified as the police,
responding in large part to public pressure, closed down and banned the Club permanently in the
weeks following the Greenwich Observatory bombing.165

The raid on the Autonomie Club along with the lack of clear evidence concerning
Bourdin’s motives resulted in tremendous media focus and scrutiny. The lack of evidence
aroused fearful curiosity and granted the press wide leniency in speculating about the bombing
and the larger plots it incorporated. The raid, meanwhile, grounded these theories as it
highlighted the presence of Anarchists in London and showed a real-life confrontation between
Anarchists and British authorities. For weeks, English newspapers following the raid printed
daily coverage on the Greenwich Outrage, filling their pages with lurid conspiracy theories and
exposés on Anarchism.

Meanwhile, the site of the explosion became a popular attraction. London crowds, and
especially the working classes, flocked to the site:

Vast crowds still visit Greenwich Park. The circuitous path
winding up the slope on the summit of which the Observatory
stands became quite blocked at intervals yesterday. The spot where
the suspect, mutilated and bleeding, was found proved an
irresistible source of attraction. The blood-marks were hidden by

165 Reynolds’s Newspaper on 4 March 1894 featured a scandalous exposé on the “dangerous” history of the
Autonomie Club and celebrated its passing: “That notorious rendezvous of West-end Anarchists, the Club
Autonomie, had it last gathering...and the place is now definitely closed.”
means of earth, which had been strewn along the path down to the point at which the body was found. Dotted about the green sward were a number of small stakes. These indicated the spots at which pieces of the body were picked up.\textsuperscript{166}

For days after the incident, police and detectives could be seen combing the woods around the explosion searching for evidence, and police barricades had to be erected to keep the crowds from trampling the crime scene. Even poor weather did not dispel the crowds; as Reynolds’s \textit{Weekly Newspaper} noted, “Although rain fell heavily in the park, large numbers of people yesterday visited the spot where the explosion took place.”\textsuperscript{167}

News of Bourdin’s funeral fuelled further official and public concern. By tradition, murderers were buried within prison walls, but because Bourdin’s bomb had not killed anyone save himself, his body was ordered to be returned to his brother in London. His brother lacked the funds necessary to pay for a funeral, and the coroner refused to release the money found on Bourdin’s body as he claimed the money was involved in a plot to use explosives illegally and was, thus, forfeited to the authorities. In protest of this decision, the Autonomie Club and other Anarchist clubs in London announced that they would cover the expense and perform the funeral. After the raucous Anarchist demonstration that had characterized Vaillant’s funeral in France only a few weeks earlier, the British public feared that Bourdin’s funeral would also become an Anarchist march rather than a solemn occasion. According to \textit{The Northern Echo}, Bourdin’s funeral “...will be carried out in a most elaborate manner,” and a “great assembly is anticipated, and it is understood that after the internment speeches in English, French, and German will be delivered by the graveside.”\textsuperscript{168} Prime Minister Asquith was challenged in a House of Commons debate on 20 February to prevent a public funeral for Bourdin, but Asquith

\textsuperscript{166} \textit{Pall Mall Gazette}, 19 February 1894.
\textsuperscript{167} Reynolds’s \textit{Weekly Newspaper}, 18 February 1894.
\textsuperscript{168} \textit{The Northern Echo}, 21 February 1894.
insisted that the body be released to Boudin’s family despite concerns.169 Public reactions to the debate reflected the budding fears over Anarchism in England. According to one editorial, “If he permits Bourdin to have a public funeral, Mr. Asquith will be risking many lives...”170

Despite the Prime Minister’s unwillingness to impair Bourdin’s right to a public burial, the anxiety of many Government officials manifested in the precautions for his funeral. The police, in communication with the Home Office and Special Branch, carefully regulated the funeral in the attempt to prevent an Anarchist demonstration. Two routes were planned by the authorities, one planned in secret for the procession and one announced to the public as a ruse. Detachments of police were assigned to the public route to patrol for gathering Anarchists, and Bourdin’s family was informed that only a few people were allowed to join the actual funeral. The Autonomie Club was similarly warned by police that no Anarchist speeches were allowed at the graveside.

At 1:00 PM on 23 February, a small band of approximately ten mourners comprised of Bourdin’s family and a few Autonomie Club members, gathered at the undertaker’s shop on Chapel Street. An open glass hearse carried Bourdin’s body to St. Pancreas Cemetery in East Finchley, and another carriage transported the family behind the hearse. Two detachments of Metropolitan Police, one mounted and one on foot, and officers from Special Branch, were assigned to escort the funeral to the gravesite. Additional troops were stationed along the public route, and another mounted detachment waited at the cemetery. Along the public route, which had been published in several papers during the previous two days, large crowds of Londoners gathered, and police along the route struggled to hold the crowds at bay and keep traffic flowing on these main roads. According to The Daily Graphic, “By noon...in the streets through which

169 See H. o C. Debate, Hansards, 20 February 1894. The English had a tradition of burying murderers inside prison walls, but in this case Bourdin had not actually killed anyone other than himself with his bomb.
170 Pall Mall Gazette, 21 February 1894.
the funeral was expected to pass there was a great gathering of people. Chapel Street at that hour began to be uncomfortably crowded...”\textsuperscript{171} Reporters estimated that 10-15,000 working-class Londoners had gathered at the undertaker’s shop alone, hoping to see the Anarchists for themselves.\textsuperscript{172}

A group of a dozen Anarchists arrived at the undertaker’s shop, and the scene quickly turned hostile. The Anarchists carried two banners with Anarchist symbols, and they began to march behind the hearse. A reserve unit of constables attempted to detain the Anarchists and tussled with them, seizing and destroying the banners. The crowd began to “hiss and hoot” at the mourners, and as the hearse set out the crowd rushed the funeral procession, attacking the mourners with workmen’s tools and pocket knives and attempting to drag Bourdin’s coffin out of the hearse. The funeral procession and the police broke into a run to escape the violent crowd, but the streets along the prescribed routes were lined with Londoners who joined in the attacks as the funeral passed by. Ahead of the procession people were hanging out of windows “hissing” and screeching phrases, including “There they are! They’re Anarchists,” and “attack!”\textsuperscript{173}

\textsuperscript{171} The Daily Graphic, 24 February 1894.
\textsuperscript{172} For a detailed account of the funeral, see The Penny Illustrated Paper and Illustrated Times, 3 March 1894.
\textsuperscript{173} Pall Mall Gazette, 24 February 1894.
Figure 5. Bourdin’s Funeral Attacked by an Angry Mob. This image depicted the police attempting to guard Bourdin’s funeral procession as it fled from the violent London crowds. *The Graphic*, 3 March 1894.

The mounted police surrounded the hearse and carriage and took off at a run, leaving the public route for the secret course to the cemetery. When the ramshackle procession finally made it to the cemetery, after a several mile run, they were reportedly trailed by some 500 Londoners who had proved rather fast on foot. The two detachments of police who had been stationed at the cemetery blocked the angry crowds from entering, and Londoners lined the gates of the cemetery behind a wall of mounted police and shouted insults at the funeral.

The police ordered the coffin to be lowered into the ground immediately and without ceremony. One report reflected, “It was the speediest funeral service on record. It occupied just about as much time as the dead man’s bomb took in exploding.” Special Branch Inspectors stood guard around the grave for the burial, as the Government had already deemed it “too dangerous” to allow Anarchists to make any funeral oration. An Anarchist who had been allowed with the procession attempted to say a few words, but as he moved towards the grave

---

and uttered, “Fellow Anarchists,” he was tackled by six of Inspector Melville’s officers and dragged away.\(^{175}\)

The press reported extensively on the funeral. Many newspapers had sent reporters and graphic artists to follow the funeral procession, and they were caught up in chaos and violence that erupted. The reporters tried to flee the angry mobs with the police and the hearse, but they were unaware of the real route to the cemetery, and many of them lost the hearse in the tumult. As one reporter noted, “The consequence was that about 15 reporters in hansom's were galloping about the wilds of Marylebone and St. John’s Wood, vainly asking if anyone had seen a dead Anarchist going that way.”\(^{176}\) No doubt reflecting their own harrowing experiences in the violence of the day’s events, the reporters roundly criticized the Government for protecting the Anarchists at the funeral and for forsaking their duty to protect the common people of London.

C. THE ANARCHIST STEREOTYPE GROWS AND THE FRAMEWORK FOR THE PUBLIC’S SHIFT TOWARD AN INTERVENTIONIST STATE IS BUILT

i. THE BRITISH PUBLIC PERCEIVES THAT ANARCHISM IS SYNONYMOUS WITH WANTON VIOLENCE

The English association between violence and Anarchism that had developed over the previous two years in connection with the cases of Ravachol, Pallas, Vaillant, and Walsall were confirmed with the Greenwich Observatory bombing. Anarchism in England became synonymous with extreme violence, death, and destruction. Wild rumors proliferated across the

\(^{175}\) *The Penny Illustrated Paper and Illustrated Times*, 3 March 1894.

\(^{176}\) *Pall Mall Gazette*, 25 February 1894.
English media of wantonly dangerous Anarchists and their violent deeds and plots. The English press took the bombing as a starting point and an archetype of Anarchism in general. Reynolds’s Weekly Newspaper reported just days after the Greenwich bomb explosion that this was no isolated event. The article claimed that in a special access visit to Scotland Yard the reporter had seen all manner of confiscated explosives, most of which were Anarchist. The explosives were largely designed to appear innocent and elude detection: dynamite disguised as a fake piece of coal, a baby bottle hiding explosive liquids, and a cigar designed to blow up its user.177 Two days after the funeral, Reynolds’s Weekly Newspaper ran another feature story with the headline, “THE CREED OF ANARCHISM: A BOOK OF TERROR!” The report alleged that Paris authorities had seized crates of Anarchist pamphlets headed for London, including many copies of L’Indicateur Anarchiste, supposedly a “secret handbook of Anarchy.” The pamphlet contained instructions for creating “suffocating bombs,” “incendiary cigarettes,” and using “invisible inks” to hide messages from the police. In the preface, the pamphlet assured its readers not to worry about constructing and using explosives, because with the clear directions provided, even “a child of twelve could carry them out as well as you.” Reynolds’s Weekly Newspaper concluded with a warning to its readers: “We need scarcely say that Anarchy...is utterly repulsive - being, apparently, the creed of insane and reckless destruction.”178

Rumors sprang up in the days and weeks to follow. The Fishing Gazette commented that fearful tales of violent Anarchists had become so common around English dinner tables as to depress the whole populace. The editor urged its readers to instead read a new series of “stranger than fiction” fish tales to cheer up the public.179 The Manchester Times on one day alone reported on two separate bombs captured by the police before they could explode: one in a

177 Reynolds’s Weekly News, 18 February 1894.
179 The Fishing Gazette, 3 March 1894, pp. 208.
London park and one inside London’s Guildhall. Many of these stories turned out to be false rumors or simply hoaxes, as was the case with the Guildhall bomb, but retractions were few, and they failed to stop the onslaught of new rumors that clearly cast Anarchists and violence as synonymous.

The Greenwich Observatory bomb site, which had quickly become a tourist attraction following the explosion, further melded Anarchism with violence and destruction in the public mind. The site gave many in London first-hand exposure and tangible evidence of Anarchism in their own backyard, whether they visited the site themselves or followed the pictorial tours in many newspapers. The scene was certainly visually striking. A large portion of the path had been marked off by ropes; the fences and trees close to the path were damaged and twisted, and a trail of blood, although covered partially with leaves and debris by the police, could still be seen for several weeks. Flags dotted the landscape, and it was well-known among the crowds that these markers indicated where pieces of the deceased had been found. For several weeks police could be seen scrambling to and fro, some holding back the crowds from trampling the site while others continued to comb the surrounding areas for small bits of evidence that they hoped would shed further light on the case. The visual spectacle the visitors encountered was deeply symbolic. On the one side was Anarchism, bloody and violent, as seen in the remains of Bourdin and his bomb. On the other side was the State, represented both by the Greenwich Observatory and by the police, in peril of Anarchist bombs and struggling to figure out what had happened.

---

180 The Manchester Times, 4 May 1894.
181 See Pall Mall Gazette, 19 February 1894; and Reynolds’s Weekly Newspaper, 18 February 1894.
ii. THE BRITISH PUBLIC PERCEIVES THAT ANARCHISM IS A DISEASE

The lack of evidence to explain the Greenwich bomb left ample room for speculation in
the press in the days following the explosion, with little need for reports to connect to any
credible evidence. Stories arguing that London was a key base of violent Anarchist actions on
the Continent circulated widely and insisted that Bourdin was a key member of the broader
Anarchist movement. *The Daily News*, detailing Bourdin’s antecedents from an unnamed
source, asserted that Bourdin had recently gone to America on a secret Anarchist mission and
that an Anarchist “central committee” kept him amply funded at all times.\(^{182}\) The *Pall Mall
Gazette* alleged that Bourdin and the French Anarchist Émile Henry, who had recently bombed
the Café Terminus in Paris, were closely connected. According to the article, “There is every
evidence of a strong resemblance between the Bourdin bomb and that used with such effect at
the Café Terminus by his old friend Émile Henry.” Whereas Henry had been caught, the
contention was that Bourdin had fled France and attained safe asylum in England.\(^{183}\) *The Weekly
Dispatch* carried this alleged connection between Bourdin and Henry in another direction. The
article went on to claim that Henry had stayed at the Autonomie Club prior to dynamiting the
Café Terminus and hypothesized that he had acquired ingredients and instructions to make his
bomb from the Autonomie Club. Emile Henry’s bombing pushed police to examine Anarchist
clubs in London, in particular the Autonomie Club where it was “well known to police” that
dangerous French and Spanish Anarchists gathered to hatch plots. Anarchists at the clubs, the
article concluded, were nervous of being discovered and fled; Bourdin, considered a leader
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\(^{182}\) *The Daily News*, 17 February 1894.
\(^{183}\) *Pall Mall Gazette*, 19 February 1894.
among the Anarchists at the Autonomie Club, took the explosives and chemicals stocked at the club to Greenwich to dispose of them before police discovered the illicit materials.\textsuperscript{184}

Unlike the Walsall Outrage two years previous, there were no defendants or police informants to guide speculation. Instead, many reports focused on the brutally dismembered remains of Bourdin. The English papers were rife with lurid tales about Bourdin’s body. One young boy relayed the gruesome story of finding Bourdin’s “severed arm” immediately off of the path up to the Observatory, where he picked up the “lifeless” object and gave it to the police. A porter at the Observatory told the press that he had found “a piece of bone about 3in. long, something like a finger. It was slightly blackened, and smelt very much like gunpowder.”\textsuperscript{185}

Bourdin’s body, therefore, became a specimen to dissect and study rather than an actor whose behavior could be questioned. The State, for example, conducted a coroner’s inquiry into the case instead of a trial, looking to Bourdin’s body to explain the crime. Detective Inspector Stephen Gummer testified for the police: “On one of the iron bars of the fence...[a] witness found a tendon or sinew, fresh, which had by the force of the impact been twisted round the railing. Above that, and to the left of the railing, he found five pieces of apparently human skin. At a subsequent examination he found on the right of the path two bones, apparently the knuckle joints of the thumb.” The resident House Surgeon from Seaman’s Hospital gave a gruesome post-mortem, describing the extent of the bomb damage and how “pieces of iron had, it seemed, been forced into the body along with bits of cloth.”\textsuperscript{186} Col. Majendie, her Majesty’s Chief Inspector of Explosives, was the expert witness for the State. He argued that from the blood trail, Bourdin no doubt was headed towards the Observatory. Majendie further analyzed the body for motive. He deduced that Bourdin must have been holding the bomb in his left hand.

\textsuperscript{184} \textit{The Weekly Dispatch}, 18 February 1894.  
\textsuperscript{185} \textit{The Weekly Dispatch}, 25 February 1894.  
\textsuperscript{186} \textit{The Weekly Dispatch}, 4 March 1894.
when it exploded and that the brown wrapper concealing the bomb must have been removed before the explosion because no paper remains were found in Bourdin’s wounds. Consequently, according to the Colonel, Bourdin must have been heading to the Observatory to immediately use bomb; there was “no possible innocent use” for this explosive. At the conclusion of the testimonies, the jury did not go out to deliberate. The inquest concluded that Bourdin was in possession of explosives for an illegal purpose and was killed accidentally in the conduct of that purpose.187

As Bourdin’s body became the key piece of evidence to explore in the case, many looked to the pioneering work of Cesare Lombroso, the famed Italian criminal anthropologist. Trained as a doctor in the 1850’s, Lombroso began studying the pathology of the physically deformed, the mentally stunted, and habitual criminals. Like many of his contemporaries, Lombroso was concerned with the strength and unity of the emerging Italian nation, and he blamed its problems and struggles on such marginal peoples. Steeped in the milieu of Social Darwinism and phrenology, Lombroso surveyed Italian soldiers for defects, studied the remains of dangerous criminals, and oversaw mental patients in several Italian hospitals from the 1860’s-1870’s. He later described his moment of inspiration from his study of the notorious criminal Vihella's remains in 1870.

At the sight of that skull, I seemed to see all of a sudden, lighted up as a vast plain under a flaming sky, the problem of the nature of the criminal - an atavistic being who reproduces in his person the ferocious instincts of primitive humanity and the inferior animals. Thus were explained anatomically the enormous jaws, high cheek bones, prominent superciliary arches, solitary lines in the palms, extreme size of the orbits, handle-shaped ears found in criminals, savages and apes, insensibility to pain, extremely acute sight, tattooing, excessive idleness, love of orgies, and the irresponsible craving of evil for its own sake, the desire not only to extinguish

187 The Newcastle Weekly Courant, 3 March 1894.
life in the victim, but to mutilate the corpse, tear its flesh and drink its blood.\footnote{Cesare Lombroso, Criminal Man, 1911. pp.xiv-xv.}

Lombroso believed that humans had descended from primitive, animalistic creatures that were characterized by their laziness and love of brutal violence. While these traits had over many generations largely disappeared from the human species, they were not entirely eradicated. According to Lombroso, a sub-species of the population were atavistic – they carried on primitive traits and often reverted in behavior to these earlier and very dangerous attributes. These traits, Lombroso felt, posed a grave danger to society, and individuals with these traits needed to be weeded out of the general population. Lombroso's way to discover such individuals was through analyzing the body. Primitive physical features, such as the shape of the skull, or abnormal physical abilities often accompanied these behavioral attributes, and thus, they were key signs of an inner danger. Lombroso's theories had gained popularity and international renown by the 1880's, and the International Congresses on Criminal Anthropology, initially founded largely on his work, occurred in major European cities from 1885 until the start of World War I. These Congresses attracted scholars, government officials, police officers, and news reporters from across Europe and widely popularized Lombroso’s ideas, giving birth to the academic field of Criminal Anthropology.\footnote{Daniel Pick, “The Faces of Anarchy: Lombroso and the Politics of Criminal Science in Post-Unification Italy” in History Workshop Journal vol. 21 1986, pp. 60-86; and Daniel Pick, Faces of Degeneration: A European Disorder, C.1848-1918, 1989. For critiques of Lombroso’s view, see Richard Lewontin et al., Not in our Genes, 1984; Stephen J. Gould, The Mismeasure of Man, 1981; and L. Taylor, The New Criminology, 1973.}

The more recent work of Michel Foucault is a useful theoretical starting point for understanding the intersection between Lombroso and the Greenwich Outrage. Michel Foucault introduced the model of the “dangerous individual” in the 1970’s in an attempt to understand changes in criminal classification and punishment in the early-nineteenth century. The
dangerous individual, he argued, was the product of a combination of the newly professionalizing fields of psychiatry and criminal justice. The dangerous individual was the creation of psychiatrists who had become involved in several particularly shocking criminal trials in the early 1800’s. These landmark criminal cases, all involving especially violent and heinous crimes, had attracted tremendous public attention, yet the cases had struck both the authorities and the public as enigmas. There were no clear explanations for the crimes; the perpetrators showed no remorse, and there were no apparent motives. Psychiatrists interpreted these landmark criminal cases and asserted their authority to comprehend the minds of the criminals. Their explanations of these heinous crimes inverted the responsibility of the criminal and the crime.

Instead of crime being the act of the individual, the crime defined the individual. Crime became an individual’s disposition rather than their actions. Thus, the crime became the symptom of an abnormal psychological state rather than a simple deed. An individual who committed murder became a “murderer,” and the new function of the penal system became the reformation of criminal characters rather than the punishment of criminal acts. According to Foucault, “for a long time the criminal had been no more than the person to whom a crime could be attributed and who could therefore be punished, today the crime tends to be no more than the event that signals the existence of a dangerous element - that is, more or less dangerous - in the social body.” In other words, crime became an identity, a psychological state that could secretly lurk under the surface of an otherwise normal man or woman.

Anarchism in England at the turn of the nineteenth century certainly fit a similar model to Foucault’s. The Anarchist outrage in Walsall in 1892 and the reports that followed over the next
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two years in both domestic and international news shocked the British public, and they wondered about violent Anarchists. The depoliticization of Anarchism in the Walsall Outrage of 1892 left the British public without a clear explanation as to why such violence was committed, as Anarchist doctrines were utterly dismissed. While the press had begun tentatively speculating on the causes of Anarchist violence before Bourdin died at Greenwich, the reality of an Anarchist bomb explosion in the heart of England generated a frenzy to understand the who and the why of Anarchism. As there were no living criminals to interrogate and explore, the dismembered body of Bourdin became a locus for much of this speculation, and the work of Lombroso became the backbone of this speculation. In general, the English public came to believe that although Anarchism was expressed as politics or even crime, what Anarchism really was, was a disease that infected individuals. Anarchism was an expression of a person’s evil inner nature. Anarchist bombings and crimes became fodder for analysis to better understand Anarchists and their character. In sum, Anarchism signaled the presence of fundamentally bad people lurking hidden in society.

The notion of unknown individuals predisposed towards dangerous and criminal behavior had the potential to generate a great deal of fear in a community; evil might lurk within the very midst of modern, peaceful society. Like many of Foucault’s concepts, the dangerous individual introduced a new way to view a particular relationship of power. Fear of criminality within communities engendered the need for security and for precautionary measures. In Foucault’s historical example, the psychiatrist seized authority by asserting his ability to identify the ersatz criminal mind and reform it, thereby removing its potential threat. Thus, in times of perceived
crisis, any individual who could claim an expertise on the particular threat could potentially shape social and political responses.\textsuperscript{191}

In Edwardian England, the particularly violent and shocking nature of England’s Anarchist outrages unleashed a fear of dangerous Anarchist criminals lurking within the nation. Suspicions that the criminals were Anarchist immigrants combined with the historical precedence for violence among Anarchists to generate a stereotype that a dangerous group of Anarchists, who sought to undermine the structure and order of society and Government, lay hidden within British society disguised as working-class immigrants. The ambiguous nature of this threat allowed many different groups of people to claim the expertise and authority to impart their views about how to restructure British society under this new peril. Thus, the fear of a group of Anarchist strangers bent on destroying society spawned a strong sense of nationalism and unity in countering the supposed evil.

Press exposés following the Greenwich Observatory bombing highlighted the notion of Anarchism as a type of disease, although disease took many forms from symbolic to biological. As an editorial in \textit{The Times} noted, “Like any other dangerous epidemic, Anarchism demands its daily bulletin; and the bulletin varies in a curious way according to the different manifestations of the disease.”\textsuperscript{192} \textit{The Liberty Review}, in their article, “Socialism, Radicalism, and Anarchism,” considered dangerous ideas to be a form of contagion and infection. The article contended that “socialist talk,” whether it took its Anarchist form or not, was the root of a disease that threatened to kill nations. It asserted that such talk grew hatred inside individuals and poisoned

\textsuperscript{191} For a detailed explanation of this concept, see Michel Foucault’s essay “About the Concept of the ‘Dangerous Individual’ in Nineteenth-Century Legal Psychiatry,” reprinted in \textit{The Essential Foucault: Selections from the Essential Works of Foucault, 1954-1984}, ed. By Paul Rabinow and Nikolas Rose, 1994.

\textsuperscript{192} \textit{The Times}, 21 February 1894.
patriotism, creating harmful citizens.\textsuperscript{193} A \textit{Pall Mall Gazette} article took a similar approach, tying Anarchism to the problems facing nationalism. The reporter insisted that,

An anarchist who loves his country is a contradiction in terms. Hatred of all that is connoted by fatherland is at the root of this epidemic of anarchy. The burdens which patriotism imposes and the sacrifices it entails are hateful to the man who has not imagination enough to realize all that is implied in national pride. The accident of birth may stamp your Santo an Italian, or Vaillant a Frenchman, but the Anarchist belongs to no country, and deliberately puts himself outside the pale of humanity.\textsuperscript{194}

In this author’s view, Anarchism plagued the social body because it striped away the love of country and the sense of sacrifice needed for a nation to survive. Anarchists became the enemies of nations and were relegated to creatures that were not even human.

Even British Socialists compared Anarchism to a disease. \textit{Reynolds’s Newspaper}, in a featured column titled, “ANARCHY - ITS CAUSE OR CURE,” interviewed several politicians on the subject, including H.M. Hyndman, the English writer who had founded The Democratic Federation, Britain’s first socialist political party. Hyndman utilized the idea of a spreading Anarchist disease to rail against capitalism and its liberal supporters. Hyndman claimed that in Anarchist figures, such as Bourdin, one can see the specter threatening modern society: “I attribute the development of Anarchism...to the large number of sensitive, conceited, overwrought lads produced by our present system, whose hatred of those whom they think close down the outlet from their faculties and produce the misery they honestly shudder at is furnished with a ready means for exhibiting itself in a dangerous form.” In other words, the brutal conditions under capitalism degraded the poor workers and transformed them into dangerous creatures. According to Hyndman, if the English fixed their degrading society and stopped “breeding” such people, then “mankind would outgrow the disease of Anarchism as it has

\textsuperscript{193} \textit{The Liberty Review: Property Owners' Guardian and Free Labour Advocate}, 29 December 1894.
\textsuperscript{194} \textit{Pall Mall Gazette}, 26 June 1894.
outgrown other and more formidable diseases of the past.” Other Socialists struck a similar note, both distancing themselves from Anarchism and blaming the evils of the industrial world for the Anarchist danger. J. Hunter Watts, an English Socialist and activist, contended in The Times that Socialists were rational and reasonable people who respected common rules of engagement in their protests. In contrast, Anarchists were characterized by their “blind passion” that “maddens” them. In Watts’ view the fault lay in economic inequality:

Society is breeding dynamitards as long as we persist in feeding the minds of children and leaving their bodies to starve. The mind outgrows the body, but instead of being a healthy mental development, the result is a monstrosity. Intellectual exacerbation and physical deterioration are engendering strange creatures who look around them with wolf-eyes of hunger, bloodshot, not softened, by the human, but disordered, intelligence that gleams in them.196

Here we witness another variance of Lombroso’s theories – people were returning to the primitive behaviors and somatic features of their ancestors. In this case, however, the wretched living conditions of the present were forcing people to return to their primitive past.

The key feature of the disease narratives was a distorted vision of individualism. Building off of the cases of Ravachol, Pallas, and Vaillant, the English press began to equate Anarchists with individuals who acted alone and out of their own deranged sense of vanity. News reports began to increasingly discuss Anarchists as dangerous individuals rather than a group or a movement. The Daily News, for example, in an interview with “anonymous” Scotland Yard officials, argued that individuals, not groups, were the real source of fear. The article claimed that in the many police raids in London following Bourdin’s explosion at Greenwich, the authorities had not discovered any signs that Anarchists manufactured bombs collectively. According to the unnamed inspectors, “The general opinion, in fact, is that no such

196 The Times, 22 February 1894.
laboratory exists, but that bombs, if manufactured in London...are contrived and put together by men who work singly and in secret, making no confidants of other anarchists.”

Anarchists were believed to operate alone because of their fixation with individualism. The *Liverpool Mercury*, attempting to define the Anarchist in March 1894, made such a case:

> Hence the practical Anarchist is, before all things, a man of action. Anarchism is a theory of personal action for the accomplishment of the social revolution, and the methods of the most active Anarchist are essentially individualist. He affirms the supremacy of the individual, his right to rebel against all authority, against that which professes to find its sanction in the divine right of the majority as much as that which rests upon the divine right of kings.

Other reports went further, insisting that an Anarchist’s individualism put the safety and happiness of all others beneath their own pride and conceit. The *Pall Mall Gazette*, for example, used a bombing in a Paris suburb to highlight the true nature of Anarchist individuals, such as Bourdin:

> …the explosions were intended to take place, not in a neighborhood of insolent affluence, but where the wretchedest of the very poor drag out their miserable lives. Never was the shallowness of the pretence of Anarchist friendship for the poor so clearly demonstrated. Anyone, high or low, Tory or himself an Anarch, middle-class or sordidly starving, may go to his death so long as Rabardy or the Vaillant, or whatever you call the wretch, gets his advertisement and sensation.

Anarchists loved the spotlight and the infamy that their attacks brought them, regardless of the damage it caused to others, even when those injured were people Anarchists claimed to be representing, such as the poor. Thus, the supposed politics of Anarchism were simply a cover for the diseased and selfish nature of Anarchists, and their pathological vanity led Anarchists to unspeakable acts. An article in *Pall Mall Gazette* in June 1894 warned its readers that
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Anarchists sought out highly symbolic and public targets because they satisfy their atavistic desires: “Ceremonial occasions give the assassin just the opportunity he craves for, because they enhance the tragic character of the crime, and gratify to the full the morbid thirst for notoriety which is responsible for nine-tenths of these outrages.” Anarchists enjoyed the suffering of others because it forced the public to notice them, fear them, or in the case of other Anarchists, venerate them.

a. SCIENCE DESCRIBES ANARCHISM AS A DISEASE

Scientists also began to take an active interest in the Anarchist menace. These scientists often suggested the need for new investigations on the bodies and minds of violent Anarchists, asserting their own authority to understand and label such dangerous individuals. These early scientific discussions on Anarchism in Britain warned the public not to dismiss Anarchists as merely crazy fanatics; instead they insisted that violent Anarchists displayed a pattern in their madness which signaled the presence of some sort of biological disease or malformation that made them unlike other humans.

The Lancet, the prestigious British medical journal founded in 1823, began regular discussions on Anarchists shortly after the Greenwich Park explosion. Bourdin’s autopsy led many of the contributing writers in The Lancet to insist that other violent Anarchists needed to be dissected for scientists to properly understand them. In February 1894, for example, in an article on the execution of the Anarchist Vaillant, the editor sharply criticized the French authorities for refraining from an autopsy of the body before burial. The editor warned that much information about this type of “disease” could have been gleaned, and to forego such investigation was

---

200 Pall Mall Gazette, 26 June 1894.
“certainly unworthy of any civilised community...” 201 These scientific views had resonance with the popular public. Press editorials, often referencing these scientific articles and discussions, made similar calls for Anarchist dissections. One instance of this is found in the 22 May 1894 edition of *The Liverpool Mercury, etc...* Commenting on the post mortem of Emile Henry in France, the reporter noted that although no clear physical abnormalities were found, such examinations were critical. He asserted that more autopsies were needed to discover the location and manifestation of the Anarchist disease, and he hoped that “real evidence” would be found in a subsequent examination of Henry’s brain. 202 Discussions in *The Lancet* gradually began to connect this notion of an Anarchist disease to other popular scientific terms of the day such as evolution, epilepsy, and contagion. In an October 1894 edition, one writer warned scientists to use caution in applying the terms of evolution, heredity, and environmental determinism to Anarchists because figures, such as Vaillant, could twist these words to defend their actions and blame society for their violence. However, the writer urged that the relationship between evolution and heredity and biologically determined criminal behavior must be carefully and thoroughly investigated to truly understand the Anarchist. 203

Scientific reports over the next several years appeared to confirm these early musings, and the scientific community in England insisted that Anarchists were fundamentally different from the rest of humanity. Anarchists were often classified by terms like “hysterico-epileptoid imbecile,” “neuropathic malefactor,” “brachycephalous epileptic,” “belva umana” (the human wild beast), or even simply, “psychopath.” 204 Some scientists analyzed Anarchists from a

202 *The Liverpool Mercury, etc...*, 22 May 1894.
biological and evolutionary perspective, studying their parents and racial background, comparing the facial features of Anarchists and other violent criminals, measuring their cranial and limb proportions, and assessing their relative physical strength and speed compared with ‘normal humans.’ Other scientists, particularly anthropologists and psychiatrists, focused on the environmental development of Anarchists; they studied their childhoods, living conditions and food supplies, moral and mental developments, group affiliations, patterns of movement, and even handwriting. Most reports concluded, albeit in a myriad of ways, that Anarchists were fundamentally different from the remainder of society, although there was little certainty that outward physical corollary symptoms could be identified.205

An article in the September 1898 edition of *The British Medical Journal*, titled “The Pathology of Anarchism,” illustrated some of the common scientific conclusions. The author, citing the influence of Lombroso, insisted that there were many different types of Anarchists, but that Anarchists could be divided into groups which shared key characteristics that differentiated them from the normal population. The first subset was the Anarchist street criminal, labeled “born malefactors.” These figures were males born with brain deformations. Their “moral and intellectual” development was, therefore, impaired, leading them to act on more primitive instincts. In particular, they suffered from bouts of “insensate rage,” destroying and killing without conscience. They tended to congregate and work in gangs, typically in criminal endeavors because they were unable to see the wrongness of their actions and had no capacity for sympathy toward their victims. They also displayed great strength and ferocity in their actions,
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205 Many books from abroad further substantiated the associations between Anarchism and disease. For example, George Frank Lydston, the prominent American doctor and criminal anthropologist took on Anarchists as a key feature of his book, *The Diseases of Society: The Vice and Crime Problem*. He categorized Anarchists and their actions in biological terms: “The true dipsomaniac almost invariably has criminal tendencies that may develop at any time. His criminality, like his periodic sprees, is of an explosive type. The impulse to kill is especially likely to develop suddenly.” Like Lombroso, Lydston saw Anarchists as a modern variant of primitive traits: “…the true criminal, anthropologically speaking, is an animal whose instincts are largely antisocial. He is a reversionary product in human evolution.” pp. 202 & 229. See also, Cesare Lombroso, *Gli Anarchici*, 1894.
but they harbored an irrational fear of pain and death. Therefore, the author claimed, enacting draconian laws was the best antidote to the Anarchist street criminal because it played on their inherent and degraded mental nature.

The second group of Anarchists the author outlined was the political assassin, and these he described as individuals that were created rather than born. This type was typically male, although in rare cases could be female, between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five. Political assassins were people who had suffered from poor living conditions and malnutrition, leading them to crime and leaving them mentally weakened and susceptible to dangerous ideas. When they encountered Anarchist ideals, promising them revenge on the society where they had suffered and a utopian future, they became “slaves” to this political passion and committed homicidal acts in “a condition of ecstasy or frenetic exultation.” Growing up alone in society, they acted alone in adulthood, assassinating and bombing in secret. They acted without fear or worry of punishment, which made corporeal punishment less effective. To combat the political assassin, the author averred, society must sanction and limit the spread of dangerous ideas and revolutionary propaganda.206

The most detailed scientific studies of Anarchism came from Lombroso himself, who began to actively survey, analyze, and classify the more notorious Anarchist assassins, such as Vaillant and Luccheni, in the 1890’s. In these studies, Lombroso detailed the atavistic traits, physical and mental abnormalities, and environmental influences that he believed inevitably led to Anarchists’ wantonly violent behavior. In particular, he labeled many Anarchists, particularly bombers and assassins, “brachycephalous epileptic,” denoting that they had distinct cranial features (a short, broad head) and suffered from uncontrolled mental fits. This combination was crucial in Lombroso’s theories, as he hypothesized that mental and physical traits existed in

combination. The mental instability made Anarchists especially dangerous, but the physical anomalies enabled one to identify such abnormal members of society. Lombroso implored the Italian government to implement these theories in schools, hoping to test and identify such individuals at an early age to eliminate or segregate them from the population before they became more dangerous. His work became a key point of conversation in Britain, and his detailed evidence on Anarchists was commonly utilized for further analysis in British scientific journals. Lombroso's work and its dissemination through the British scientific community gave an air of scientific respectability to the many British scientists who declared Anarchists biologically and categorically different from the general British population.

An editorial in The Lancet on 19 November 1898 illustrated a clear example of the way Lombroso's work entered England and was modified to suit English sensibilities. The editor agreed with Lombroso that, “character is largely, if not wholly, conditioned by organization, and that this in turn is largely, if not wholly, conditioned by inheritance and environment, physical and moral.” The article summarized the life of the Italian Anarchist Luccheni, from his physical features and anthropometric measurements to his young life with a “dipsomaniac” father and his abandonment to a state criminal boarding house. The editor agreed with Lombroso that it was “fairly established that we have to deal with a “brachycephalous epileptic,” in whom, “as in primitive man and as in the typical anarchist, crime is confounded with action” – the natural expression of an “absolute want of the moral sense.”” However, the article diverged from Lombroso's theories, and ultimately blamed the problem on immigration. Particular countries, the editor noted, produce these abnormal men and unleashed them on the remainder of the world. He blamed Italy’s temperament, biological inheritance, economy, and society for many of the
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world’s Anarchists and warned that Italy was “in imminent danger of becoming an international pariah.”

b. POPULAR MEDIA DESCRIBES ANARCHISM AS A DISEASE

In addition to the numerous press articles reporting on Anarchists as diseased and abnormal individuals, representations in English popular fiction also characterized Anarchists as something fundamentally different from the normal population. In H.G. Wells’ short story, “The Stolen Bacillus,” first published in June 1894 in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, Wells connected the threat of Anarchists with the threat of a virulent disease. In the story an Anarchist, under a false identity, paid a visit to a bacteriologist in London, who proudly displayed a vial of cholera bacteria. The scientist, sensing the keen interest of his visitor, grandly exclaimed how this simple vial inserted into London’s water supply would wreak...

...death—mysterious, untraceable death, death swift and terrible, death full of pain and indignity—would be released upon this city, and go hither and thither seeking his victims. Here he would take the husband from the wife, here the child from its mother, here the statesman from his duty, and here the toiler from his trouble. He would follow the water-mains, creeping along streets, picking out and punishing a house here and a house there where they did not boil their drinking-water, creeping into the wells of the mineral-water makers, getting washed into salad, and lying dormant in ices. He would wait ready to be drunk in the horse-troughs, and by unwary children in the public fountains. He would soak into the soil, to reappear in springs and wells at a thousand unexpected places. Once start him at the water supply, and before we could ring him in, and catch him again, he would have decimated the metropolis.

The Anarchist became overjoyed by this news, barely containing his excitement, and he declared that Anarchists were wasting their time with bombs when such a virus existed.
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bacteriologist was distracted by his wife, the Anarchist stole the cholera to infect London’s
waters, but he accidentally broke the glass container while trying to escape. Undeterred, the
Anarchist drank the remnant drops from the ground and ran throughout London, brushing against
people he passed to infect them. As it turned out, however, the bacteriologist was overstretching
his work, claiming that his research was on the deadly Asiatic cholera, when in fact it was a
different form of cholera that merely turned animals blue. The Anarchist failed to kill the
population of London, but his skin was turned blue by the bacteria, symbolically displaying a
diseased exterior to match the diseased nature of his inner destructive tendencies.  

One of the most popular literary accounts of Anarchists in England came from two
former Anarchists, the sisters Helen and Olivia Rossetti, who published the Anarchist journal
*The Torch* in their youth out of their family home in London. Their fictionalized autobiography,
*A Girl Among the Anarchists* (1903), written under the pseudonym Isabel Meredith, reflected at
length upon the nature and the character of the Anarchist individuals they encountered in their
early years. The Rossetti sisters, while apologetic for the good intentions of harmless
Anarchists, denounced and vilified the more extremist and violent Anarchists:

> Curiously enough I have found most Anarchists of the mildest
dispositions. I have met meek Germans (there are meek Germans
still extant) who even in their wildest Anarchic indignation seemed
as little capable of hurting a living soul as of setting the Elbe on
fire. For it must be understood that the "red wing" of the
Anarchists is a very small section of the body of philosophers
known as Anarchists. There is no doubt that those of the dynamite
section are practically insane.

The sisters regularly turned to the idea of disease to describe the innate and flawed nature of the
more nefarious Anarchists. Describing one acquaintance, the authors noted that, “Men like
Myers are but the outcome of unnatural and vitiated conditions; they are produced by the very
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society which it is our object to abolish—as all manner of disease is produced by vitiated air.”

The Rossetti sisters detailed many similar figures, such as Giannoli:

…his features were pronounced, with a prominent nose and full, well-cut mouth hidden by a heavy moustache. There was a look of considerable strength about the man, and fanatical determination strangely blended with diffidence—a vigorous nature battling against the inroads of some mortal disease.

For the Rossetti sisters, the extremism, violence and lack of empathy displayed by such Anarchists marked them as both fundamentally different and inherently dangerous.  

*The Secret Agent* by Joseph Conrad was the most popular and enduring work of literary fiction to feature Anarchists, even forming the basis for Alfred Hitchcock’s 1936 movie, *Sabatoge*. Although Joseph Conrad claimed to have no knowledge of the Greenwich Observatory bombing, it was readily apparent that the Greenwich Outrage was the model upon which his novel was based. In *The Secret Agent*, Conrad attempted to take a more balanced approach toward Anarchists than many of his contemporaries, and his story reflected the many conspiracy theories that surrounded the maligned Walsall Anarchists. However, he, too, utilized the growing stereotype of Anarchists as fundamentally different and diseased people.

Two characters featured prominently in *The Secret Agent*. One was a man known as Verloc, and Verloc was a foreign Anarchist who lacked political conviction and purpose. Verloc was the police spy of a foreign government and had been planted inside England to commit an act of Anarchist violence in the hopes that it would strengthen England’s stance against Anarchism. The other character was a young man named Steevie. Steevie was the brother-in-law of Verloc, and he was a mentally impaired individual who was plainly different from the general English public due to his mental deficits. He was quick to rashness and violence; he could not hold a job. He enjoyed committing acts of violence and had no understanding that
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violence was morally wrong. Steevie was also readily susceptible to “dangerous talk”, and he was excited by the prospect of being involved in violent acts. Ultimately, it was Steevie whom Verloc convinced to carry the bomb to the Greenwich Observatory. While en route to the Greenwich Observatory Steevie inadvertently blows himself up, presumably due to his diminished mental capacity.

In *The Secret Agent*, Conrad illustrated that Anarchism was merely a ruse, a political excuse to engage in wanton violence. By perpetrating a bombing for the purpose of curtailing the Anarchist movement, Verloc indicated that Anarchism was not an ideology concerned with its own cause. Rather, it was an ideology bent on destruction for no reason other than the thrill of destruction itself. The poor character and diseased nature of Anarchists was also exemplified by Verloc. He was described as lazy, an individual who “breakfasted in bed, and remained wallowing there with an air of quiet enjoyment till noon every day – and sometimes even to a later hour.” The disease-like nature of Anarchism was explicitly stated by Conrad: “Mr. Verloc was an intermittent patron. He came and went without any very apparent reason. He generally arrived in London (like the influenza) from the Continent, only he arrived unheralded by the Press.”

Steevie was a more significant character than his brother-in-law, Verloc. Through Steevie, Joseph Conrad illustrated the true danger of Anarchists – they were abnormal, deficient people. It was easy for the reader to accept that Steevie was damaged. He acted like a young child, which was often how Anarchists were portrayed, and his motivations were very simple. Due to his simplistic and almost animalistic instincts, Anarchist violence suited his temperament as a throwback to the earlier, more primitive impulses that Lombroso described:

He was delicate, and, in a frail way, good looking, too, except for the vacant droop of his lower lip. Under our excellent system of
compulsory education he had learned to read and write, notwithstanding the unfavorable aspect of the lower lip. But as errand-boy he did not turn out a great success. He forgot his messages; he was easily diverted from the straight path of duty by the attractions of stray cats and dogs, which he followed down narrow alleys into unsavory courts; by the comedies of the streets, which he contemplated open-mouthed...or by the dramas of fallen horses, whose pathos and violence induced him sometimes to shriek piercingly in a crowd.  

Although Steevie was the bomber in Conrad’s tale, Steevie was a bomber without a cause. He did not blow things up to advance a purpose; he blew things up because he enjoyed it. Not only did Steevie inherently enjoy violence, but he was also easily excited by violence and easily manipulated. Because of these mental deficits, Steevie, like so many Anarchist followers, was coerced into committing terrible acts. It was through his portrayal of Steevie as a readily manipulated pawn that Conrad highlighted a serious danger of Anarchism. Anarchism was not dangerous simply because it employed violence; it was dangerous because it put violence into the hands of those people who were incapable or ill-suited to control violence. Anarchism took root in the minds of the foolish, the diseased, and the damaged and enticed them to enact senseless harm upon the innocent simply because they enjoyed the excitement of it.

As the British public became increasingly convinced that Anarchism was a disease that preyed upon those people who were mentally deficient, rather than a political ideology or a mere state of mind, their focus shifted away from simply analyzing Anarchist individuals. Instead, the popular British discourse shifted to identifying Anarchist individuals, and the press began to editorialize on how everyday citizens could identify Anarchists lurking in their neighborhoods. Most articles considered Anarchists to be most common in large urban cities and to be solitary people who were somehow isolated from society. An article titled “The Anarchist Peril” stated, “It is in great industrial centres, and among workers in the sedentary trades, where the greatest
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disposition is shown to accept anarchist doctrines; and the majority of Anarchists are either men who are alone while at work, or whose occupation isolates them for the time being from their companions.” Beginning on 29 September 1894 The Illustrated Police News etc. launched a “series of enthralling articles dealing with the careers of the leading European Anarchists” and included identifying characteristics that were often associated with Anarchists. The author of these articles, Paul Martin, saw common threads and types within the Anarchist community and aimed to “make known to the world the habits and surroundings of the extraordinary men who are creating in our midst the Anarchist Reign of Terror.” In addition to the highly reclusive and solitary demeanor mentioned by other authors, Martin contended that Anarchism became more prevalent as one traveled farther south in Europe and asserted that most Anarchists resided in deplorable conditions: “The contrast between the life and variety of Paris and the bleak, desolate appearance of the country just outside was striking. [The birthplace of Vaillant], although only seven miles away, is as depressing a town as any to be met within the English “Black Country.” He further ascertained that Anarchists were not religious men since they did not desire priests for confessions before their executions. The Pall Mall Gazette also sought to identify the Anarchist and described the him as an educated man, though not always an intelligent one, who “poses as a philosopher” and “is rampant with jealousy that others should seem more profound than himself.”

The difficulty that these authors combated in clearly identifying Anarchists was that Anarchists were secretive people whose inner natures, despite Lombroso’s theories, did not
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necessarily manifest itself in the person’s outward appearance. In sum, Anarchists did not always appear evil. As was stated by The Manchester Times following the execution of French Anarchist, Émile Henry, “Those spectators who had pictured to themselves a typical ferocious Anarchist were considerably taken aback by Henry’s appearance. He is a small, fair man, with a small mustache and a short beard....neatly dressed in black, and altogether he looked a self-possessed, jaunty, young fellow of the upper artizan or clerc class.”217 To rectify this ambiguity regarding who was or was not an Anarchist, The Daily News asserted in June 1895 that fingerprints needed to be adopted by governments to identify the Anarchist individuals who would otherwise remain hidden due to their ability to blend into proper society.218

Despite the uncertainty of how to identify Anarchists, the British public continued to focus on locating the Anarchists lurking in their midst. They were no longer content to identify Anarchists simply by the violent crimes they committed. Rather, the public viewed these violent crimes as an inevitable symptom of the Anarchist disease. For these diseased, depraved individuals violence was inevitable, and the only way to prevent Anarchist violence from occurring in England was to discover and expel Anarchists before they committed their crimes: “Whether the wretched man who died on Thursday night, after one despairing appeal to the civilised humanity against which he was in league, really hoped to destroy the Observatory at Greenwich, or met his fate by accident, having no immediate intention of committing crime, is hardly an important question.”219 News of the World claimed, “All that now remains to be done is to investigate the clues obtained, and then with ruthless hand cut from its very roots the cancer in our own midst, which has been allowed to grow and fester there too long.”220 Instead of
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concerning themselves with the deplorable acts committed by Anarchists, such as Bourdin, the British public began to focus on why Anarchists were in England and how to go about removing them.

iii. ANARCHISM IS LINKED TO IMMIGRATION

One potent mechanism deemed responsible for the rise of Anarchists within England was immigration, and French immigrants were perceived as particularly prone to Anarchism. When discussing the French Anarchist Émile Henry the *Pall Mall Gazette* stated,

> Henry is a typical product of the social and political state brought on by extreme industrialism in combination with revolutionary ideas and universal military service. He owes his temperament to the storm that burst over France in 1870, and the agitation of the subsequent ten years. All the Frenchmen born about the same time that he was have exacerbated nerves like Henry’s. Indeed, the generation which dates from the early years of the seventies are already classed by doctors as “the children of the invasion and commune,” and as “cases for scientific study.”
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*The Daily News* warned its readers that women entering England from France should also be feared; the reporter asserted, there are “...women who are known to have travelled in every country in Europe preaching “la propaganda par le fait” with a violence which is said to surpass the most extreme efforts of their male counterparts.”

Political refugees were also considered responsible for the importation of Anarchism into England from the Continent. Refugees from France were seen as particularly insidious; although refugees from Draconian countries, such as Spain and Italy, were also viewed with suspicion.
The Pall Mall Gazette elaborated extensively on the growing distrust of political refugees in England: “Why should we be troubled, for our sins, with these miscreants at all. Expelled from France and Spain, they betake themselves to this country like swine to the mud…[Political asylum] was never intended to cover infamous scoundrels who have deliberately declared war upon every institution and every ordinance.” The article goes so far as to refer to all immigrants as the “Anarchist brood.”

Continuing to utilize the psychology of disease, the press routinely compared the infiltration of Anarchists into the country to the infiltration of vermin. Similar to the way that pests were imported into the country via ships, the British public began to believe that the disease of Anarchism was being imported into England via immigration: “We are always suffering from our proximity to Europe. The Continent, which is not so clean and not so civilised as this country, has often sent us its diseases of the body, and now it seems to be making us a present of its crazed and desperate political fanatics. It is true that we have occasionally discovered a native specimen, but the soil is not a very kindly one.”

The press’s certainty that immigrants were responsible for the rise of Anarchism in Britain also highlighted another common belief of the time – English men were impervious to Anarchism. When The Bristol Mercury and Daily Post wrote on the raid of the Anarchist Autonomie Club on 16 February they claimed, “The club where these homicidal lunatics met had a French name: its members were Germans, Frenchmen, Poles, Russians – but not English.”

Englishmen were too good and too just to swayed by the malevolent ideology and wanton violence of Anarchism. However, the fear of Anarchism’s effect on the masses lingered. While most Englishmen were not considered to be susceptible to the boons of Anarchism, there was a
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pervasive fear that the ignorant populous in England, people such as Joseph Conrad’s ‘Steevie’ and the uneducated masses of immigrants, could become hapless Anarchist pawns, tricked into wicked behavior due to the powers of Anarchist rhetoric and propaganda. The following cartoon

![Figure 6. Ignorant Working-Classes Become Anarchist ‘Dupes’](image)

*Figure 6. Ignorant Working-Classes Become Anarchist ‘Dupes’.* This image depicted the British public’s fear that poor, uneducated Englishmen and immigrants would be manipulated by cunning Anarchists into becoming Anarchist pawns – individuals who committed terrible crimes without fully understanding their actions. *FUN*, 9 June 1894.

in *FUN* illustrated the public’s fear that unknowing ‘dupes’ would be manipulated by cunning Anarchist masterminds into committing terrible atrocities. Much like the emancipated English Anarchists, Westley and Ditchfield, who were declared unwitting accomplices to the Walsall bomb-making plot, this image portrayed English Anarchists as ‘dupes’ – foolish men who were easily manipulated and ignorant of the damage they were perpetrating. This image depicted a sleeping Englishman being pulled from his bed by a scheming Anarchist and then manipulated into detonating a bomb by the power of Anarchist propaganda. Meanwhile the slumbering Englishman never awoke during his journey, signifying his unwitting duplicity in Anarchist violence. The English public feared that the creation of unintelligent English pawns or ‘dupes’ would spread the disease of Anarchism across England, particularly in highly immigrant boroughs, such as the East End.
iv. THE BRITISH PUBLIC PERCEIVES THAT ANARCHISM NECESSITATES STATE INTERVENTION

Some of the first signs of the English public rejecting traditional liberalism arose out the emerging fear that Anarchism would spread like a contagion throughout the poor and immigrant masses. Following the police raid of the Anarchist Autonomie Club, of which Bourdin was believed to be a member, a flurry of exposés, articles, and editorials were printed condemning the dangers presented to the public by an organization such as the Autonomie Club. According to a *News of the World* exposé on 18 February the Autonomie Club in London had become the center of Anarchism in Europe and a vast Anarchist conspiracy was based out of London. This article asserted that Bourdin had been the leader of a particularly violent gang of Anarchists that had included Vaillant and Henry. The exposé also claimed that the amoral men who attended the Autonomie Club, such as Bourdin, had previously possessed the necessary nature to become Anarchists but that it was not until these men had arrived to a nurturing environment, such as London, where both freedoms and ideas could merge, that these men had become Anarchists. Thus, according to the *News of the World*, the liberal rights and freedoms in England were aiding in the creation Anarchists rather than preventing them. ²²⁶ The *Pall Mall Gazette*, on covering the raid, wrote, “...it is now notorious that London, by reason of that very right of asylum, has become the head centre of practical Anarchism.” The report further insisted that, “A whole department is engaged in watching the Anarchists, but still they make themselves heard. All this goes to prove that more stringent measures must be taken, and we welcome the raid upon the
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Autonomie Club last night as probably the inauguration of a new method of dealing with them."  

Even members of the House of Lords uttered dissatisfaction with England’s liberal laws of privacy and free speech. When hearing the Aliens Bill of 1894 Lord Halsbury exclaimed, “…can any human being doubt that the Autonomie Club was a club of foreign conspirators with aims that are inhuman, for anarchists are hostes humani generis? If the law of this country permits a nucleus of persons to meet in a club of this kind and hatch plots whilst foreign countries have the right to seize such conspirators and deal with them, where are they likely to collect except in the country which stands alone in assuming no special powers for their suppression?” Several weeks after the notorious raid on the Autonomie Club, the Government deemed that the Autonomie Club’s patrons and ideas were too dangerous, and, despite the numerous laws governing freedom of speech in England, the Autonomie Club was closed in the name of public safety.

The large mob of Englishmen who attacked the Anarchists gathered at Bourdin’s funeral and the press’s harsh criticism of the protection afforded to the Anarchists by the police during the attack further exposed the British public’s first rumblings of discontent with the liberal English State. When News of the World reported on Bourdin’s funeral it claimed that the mob’s attack on the Anarchist mourners “furnishes an object-lesson which ought not to be lost.” The Brief: A Legal Review of Reviews published a scathing criticism of the Government’s protection of the Anarchists at the funeral and printed an explicit directive asserting the State’s responsibility to contain the Anarchist menace: “It is to the Home Secretary...that society turns for the strong hand to break up the gang of miscreants who sport with human life and glory in the
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game.” The article further advocated that the State should import stronger measures, such as Prevention of Crimes in Ireland Act of 1882 to give the police “...special powers [that] were found to be of the utmost use” against those who commit such “cruel and callous crime”. 230

The summer of 1894 continued the divisive dialogue between those who believed that liberty was a right that would ensure England’s safety and those who believed that liberty in matters such as freedom of speech and acceptance of Anarchist clubs was a weakness that would expose England to additional Anarchist violence. This discord was witnessed in the extensive press coverage of the French Chamber debate of the Anti-Anarchist Bill in July of 1894 and in the widespread publication of political cartoons in England. Many political cartoons, such as the following one, depicted the police or the State, who upheld the traditional liberal laws and allowed liberty, being destroyed by the very liberty that they had espoused.

Figure 7. British Police Officer Destroyed by an Anarchist Bomb. This was one example of the political cartoons published after the Greenwich Outrage. In the cartoon, the police officer inadvertently interrupted an Anarchist placing a bomb. The officer, trying to be helpful, returned the dropped package concealing the bomb to the Anarchist. The Anarchist rewarded the officer by giving him the package, but the unlucky officer was destroyed, and his honest act unwittingly aided Anarchism’s goal of destruction. *Chums*, 1 August 1894. p. 783.
In short, by the end of 1894, the British media was beginning to purport the seemingly radical notion that traditional liberalism was no longer capable of protecting the nation from danger.

D. CONCLUSION

The Greenwich Outrage in 1894 brought the Anarchist violence that had been plaguing the Continent into England. No longer was English Anarchism limited to small and typically quiet Anarchist clubs and a suspicious bomb-making plot alleged in Walsall. With the Greenwich Observatory bombing an Anarchist bomb rent British soil, and the British public perceived that Anarchism was a credible threat to England. The bomb site became a popular tourist destination for Londoners and witnessing firsthand the evidence of Bourdin’s scattered body and the destruction he left behind reaffirmed the nation’s connection between Anarchism and violence and solidified the public’s conviction that Anarchism lacked any political legitimacy.

The criminal theories of Lombroso became widely adopted by the British press to understand Anarchism as England speculated over Bourdin and his body. According to Lombroso, crime was the result of very old ancestral traits that had been bred out of many people but lingered in others. Lombroso’s work and the dissection of Bourdin’s body as a specimen yielded a scientific analysis of Anarchism in England in the wake of the Greenwich Outrage. The British nation’s understanding of Anarchists at this time also reflected the theories later purported by Michel Foucault. Foucault hypothesized that the fields of psychiatry and criminology merged in the late 1800’s to understand crime as an individual’s disposition rather than an individual’s actions. He argued that ‘dangerous individuals’ existed who possessed a
mental predisposition for crime and anti-social behavior. Thus, the crimes committed by these people were not isolated acts but were instead a reflection of the individual’s inner nature. As a result of the Greenwich Outrage and the following media analyses, the English public determined that Anarchism was a mental disease that was characterized by a penchant for crime, death, and destruction. Thus, after 1894 Englanders perceived the violent crimes committed by Anarchists as symptoms of their deeper, biologically-based mental illness. While Anarchists expressed their crimes as a political agenda, the British public concluded that Anarchists were simply diseased, evil people afflicted with a malady that yearned for death and destruction.

In the months following the Greenwich Observatory bombing, numerous studies and descriptions of Anarchism as a disease abounded. Stemming from infamous Anarchists, such as Valliant, who proudly proclaimed their Anarchist ideologies on the witness stands, the British press highlighted the excessive vanity, selfishness, and individualism of Anarchists. Scientists also concurred with the disease theory of Anarchism and added validity to the conclusion that Anarchists were abnormal and diseased people. Scientific reports concluded that Anarchists were biologically diseased and not simply insane; their mental illness resulted in flawed and inhuman logic that dictated their depraved behavior. Fictional works also described Anarchists as diseased and debased individuals, and these fictional tales propagated and became part of British popular culture, further solidifying the stereotype of Anarchists as diseased, abnormal, and mentally deficient people.

Once the British public determined that Anarchism was a disease they also concluded that Anarchist violence could not be prevented if Anarchists were present. Crime was the inevitable outcome of the Anarchist condition. Therefore, many British citizens believed that the only way to protect England from Anarchists was to identify and expel Anarchists before they
could commit their crimes. Many Englanders also feared that without control the disease of Anarchism would spread like a contagion across England. They worried that poor quality and mentally ill people, such as Conrad’s Steevie in *The Secret Agent*, would become mesmerized by the death and destruction of Anarchism and would spread Anarchist violence.

After the Greenwich Outrage, the British public began to associate Anarchism with immigrants and political refugees, especially with immigrants from Draconian countries, such as France and Italy. They worried that immigrants would transmit the Anarchist contagion from the Continent into England where other abnormal individuals, or ‘dupes’ as the public referred to them, would become infected by Anarchism. Thus, as a result of the Greenwich Observatory bombing, the British public became consumed with the menace of Anarchism. As the danger of Anarchism brought new fears into the cities of England, British citizens began the first murmurings of discontent regarding liberal English ideals of liberty and freedom.
IV.


A. THE GAP YEARS, 1895-1908 – A MILIEU OF DANGER: ANARCHISM BETWEEN THE GREENWICH & THE TOTTENHAM OUTRAGES

“The fallacy of Anarchism may be signalised in a word as the idolisation of the abstract notion of liberty...the autonomy of the individual, is his god, before whom he bows in slavish adulation.”

_The Woman’s Signal_, 14 November 1895.

In reality, the Anarchist movement in England declined after the Greenwich Outrage in 1894, albeit a brief resurgence within the Syndicalist movement during the first decade of the twentieth century. In the British press, however, the fear of Anarchism continued to grow in the years following the Greenwich Outrage. Between the Greenwich Outrage and the next Anarchist spectacle, the Tottenham Outrage in 1909, both international and domestic events and concerns became inextricably linked with Anarchism, further defining, mythologizing, and increasing Englanders’ perceived Anarchist threat. In particular, the idea of Anarchists as extreme individuals, a polarizing notion of England’s concept of individualism, developed around the specter of Anarchism. In addition, the fear of Anarchists exacerbated the fear of immigrants as immigrants gained a strong association with Anarchism in the British public mind. As a result,
public opinion and responses to Anarchism shifted significantly and became more extreme between 1895 and 1908. Several factors accounted for the mounting fear of Anarchism that developed during ‘the Gap Years,’ 1895-1908, but the spate of Anarchist assassinations worldwide, Britain’s debate over immigration, and the First Russian Revolution were the primary influences responsible for heightening the British nation’s fear of Anarchists during this time.

i. KEY EVENTS IN THE GAP YEARS, 1895-1908

a. AN ERA OF ANARCHIST ASSASSINATIONS

Between 1895 and 1908, several Anarchists in Europe and America, utilizing the idea of ‘propaganda by the deed,’ attempted to assassinate prominent political leaders. Few major Western countries were spared from this dramatic wave of assassinations. In June 1894, an Anarchist killed Sadi Carnot, the President of France, in his carriage on his way to a theatre in Lyon. In August 1897, Anarchist Michele Angiolillo shot dead Spanish Prime Minister Antonio Cánovas del Castillo while he was vacationing with his family. In September 1898, Luigi Lucheni, after failing to assassinate the Duc d’Orleans in Geneva, found and stabbed to death Empress Elisabeth of Austria-Hungary as she walked along the shore of Lake Geneva. In April 1900, Italian-American Anarchist Gaetano Bresci killed Italian King Umberto I in Monza with four shots from his pistol. The following year, in September 1901, Leon Czolgosz, who claimed to have been heavily influenced by the writings of Anarchist Emma Goldman, shot and killed United States President William McKinley at point-blank range while he was greeting the public.
in Buffalo, New York. In February 1908, King Carlos I of Portugal and his son, the Crown Prince Luis Filipe, were assassinated by Anti-Monarchists when they ambushed the Royal carriage. Although Anti-Monarchists, not Anarchists, were responsible for the Portuguese assassinations, the international press widely declared the assassins to be Anarchists because of reported Anarchist elements within the Anti-Monarchist movement. Many additional Anarchist assassination attempts failed, but even failures were reported on heavily by the British press, especially the Brussels Outrage in April 1900, when England’s Prince of Wales was shot but not killed by an Anarchist while on a trip to Denmark.

These assassinations perpetuated the fear of Anarchism in England through the rabid press coverage that followed them. As Anarchists were killing key political leaders the British public perceived them as a legitimate threat to the State. The *Pall Mall Gazette*, in a feature article on the threat of Anarchist assassinations in August 1897, noted the precarious situation of the State: “The fear of death is all the law has to threaten the Anarchist with... He may be intoxicated with an idea, or driven desperate by hunger, or, as we have often seen, he may not realize the consequences. But he has it in his power to give his own life, and take that of a Tsar or a Prime Minister – the figurehead or the admiral of the ship of State.”

The coverage of the assassinations in England’s press turned increasingly to the use of disease psychology to explain Anarchists and their motivations. Anarchists became
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incomprehensible and abnormal creatures who simply enjoyed killing. This view was especially reinforced by the death of United States’ President William McKinley. Commentators in England could fathom reasons why subjects might want to kill authoritarian leaders, such as Tsar Nicholas II or Spanish Prime Minister Antonio Cánovas del Castillo. However, McKinley was not an autocratic ruler; he was the elected leader of a democratic people, comparable to the democratic institutions of England. *The Saturday Review of Politics, Science, Literature, and Art* remarked, “With cold-blooded passionless impartiality they have demonstrated that they make no distinction between one form of government and another. The despotism of Russia and the Republicanism of America are alike under their ban. They have no gradations of approval or disapproval of political systems. They hate the Tsar not a wit more than they hate McKinley.”

Striking down a dictator was at least understandable; attacking democracy itself was irrational.

The British press took careful note that many assassins were from foreign countries. This furthered already existing fears and concerns over immigrants in England. Newspapers regularly reported that dangerous Anarchists were fleeing to England where immigration laws were far more lax than in America and much of Continental Europe. Several members of Parliament fearfully questioned the Prime Minister in a session of Parliament in early 1898 whether the many reports of Anarchists flooding into England were indeed true. Many of these rumors followed by Parliament and public alike asserted that London was becoming a hub for Anarchists who used the city as a safe base to plan out their killings. This led to widespread public condemnation of British immigration laws. A reporter for the *Pall Mall Gazette* echoed a
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common sentiment: “Why should we be troubled, for our sins, with these miscreants at all. Expelled from France and Spain, they betake themselves to this country like swine to the mud.”

In the 1890’s the building international fear of Anarchists and their purported movement between countries led to the creation of the first International Anti-Anarchist Conference in 1898 in Rome. As early as the late 1880’s there were calls for international cooperation against Anarchists as numerous Western Countries, including France, Italy, Spain, and Austro-Hungary began to legislate against the spread of Anarchist propaganda and against the proliferation of dynamite and other explosives. Ultimately it was the assassination of the Austrian Empress Elizabeth in 1898 by an Italian Anarchist that precipitated the first International Anti-Anarchist Conference as Italy sought support from other European countries to contain its growing Anarchist problem. Although England was the last country to agree to attend the conference, England’s attendance was indicative of the Government’s growing fear of Anarchism. In 1881 and 1893 Britain had previously helped to scuttle attempts to form an international congress to deal with Nihilists and then Anarchists, the latter being pushed by French and Spanish governments in an effort to create an international police force after a spate of Anarchist bombings in both countries.
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The 1898 International Anti-Anarchist Conference in Rome was attended by twenty-one countries and spent considerable time debating how to define Anarchism, eventually agreeing upon, “any act that used violent means to destroy the organization of society” and insisted in the final protocol of the conference that Anarchism had “nothing in common with politics” and was not “under any circumstances to be regarded as a political doctrine.”

Despite tremendous disagreement at the conference, many proposals passed, including provisions to introduce legislation in respective countries to prohibit the “illegitimate” use and possession of explosives, to prohibit membership in Anarchist organizations, and to outlaw the distribution of Anarchist propaganda, and rendering assistance to or inciting Anarchists. Restrictions attempting to limit press coverage of Anarchist events were also passed by some countries, and the conference concluded with a provision that every country should establish a secret national surveillance agency that would work with the similar agencies of other countries to track, monitor, and foil Anarchists and their plots across borders. In perpetuation of the scientific analysis of Anarchists, several countries advocated that the surveillance agencies should adopt the *portrait parlé* identification method that took measurements of the head and body, which were then expressed as a series of numbers that could be transmitted via telegraph to identify a suspect in another country. Britain, who did not sign the final protocol at the conference, was the only country to promise legislative action, with British Ambassador Sir Philip Currie stating that it was Britain’s “duty as a member of the European family” to do so.
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was drafted, these reforms never made it to Parliament for a discussion or a vote, and when speaking at Parliament on 7 February 1899 the Queen insisted that “the British government cannot agree with all the proposals of the conference”.242

Despite the Government’s reluctance to embrace any of the measures agreed upon in the 1898 International Anti-Anarchist Conference, the British press continued to expound upon the plight of Anarchism that afflicted Europe and the need for international cooperation to contain the pestilence.243 The British press argued that political asylum and lax immigration laws were allowing Anarchists to move to freely between European countries, thus necessitating the need for international cooperation to identify and apprehend Anarchist criminals. *The Illustrated Police News, etc.* claimed on 4 August 1900, “They are wild beasts of the most ferocious description, so like wild beasts they should be remorselessly and untiringly tracked down, and served with the same fate they so calmly mete out to the victims marked down by the villainous chiefs of their society. All governments should unite in this task.”244

In 1901, following the assassination of United States’ President William McKinley by a Polish-American Anarchist, the international community vowed to take a stronger stance against Anarchism and convened the 2nd International Anti-Anarchist Conference of 1904 in St. Petersburg. In this conference, ten countries signed a secret protocol that agreed to greater exchange of information regarding Anarchists between national police agencies and commitment
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244 *The Illustrated Police News, etc.*, 4 August 1900.
to launch an offensive against Anarchism, ambiguous though that offensive was. Again Britain did not sign the 1904 protocol, but its delegates expressed a “willingness to assist” the police efforts of other countries in tracking Anarchists.²⁴⁵

Although a handful of Parliamentary members supported implementing the International Anti-Anarchist Conferences’ protocols, the majority of MP’s and prominent British politicians did not advocate such measures against Anarchists. Most Government officials remained committed to the notion of Britain providing a safe haven for the political refugees of Europe. The Government in large part agreed that Britain, a freer and more democratic society, was not as dangerous a place as the Continent and, thus, did not need such stringent measures. The greater public, however, did not condone the Government’s lax attitude toward Anarchists. Even The Times, who was typically more reserved, created a regular column in 1898 titled, “The Repression of Anarchism,” explaining how governments should combat the spreading Anarchist threat.²⁴⁶ The Pall Mall Gazette weighed in on the International Anti-Anarchist Conference of 1898’s idea of immigrant registration, stating, “…we cannot see that the Continental system of registering all foreigners on arrival amounts to much. A merely normal liar can always invent a fake name, and what Government can afford to put detectives on the track to see if each one is telling the truth?”²⁴⁷ Despite opposition in the press, the British Government remained resolute in preserving the traditional liberties of free speech and asylum for political refugees and eschewed international Anarchist surveillance and alien registration systems endorsed on the Continent. Meanwhile, the British public was growing ever more fervent in their desire for anti-Anarchist measures and international cooperation.

²⁴⁶ The Times, 19 September 1898.
²⁴⁷ Pall Mall Gazette, 25 November 1898.
b. WIDESPREAD CALLS FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM

One method of curbing Anarchism in England that the British public particularly advocated was immigration reform. In 1903, the Royal Commission on Alien Immigration Report issued statistics for the numbers of immigrants entering England, stating that in eight years, from 1894 to 1902, immigration into England had nearly tripled from 76,234 immigrants in 1894 to 200,011 immigrants in 1902.\(^{248}\) In addition, several new statistical reports emerged at the turn of the century positing that large numbers of low-quality, poor, and undesirable immigrants were destroying the nation. In Booths’ widely circulated 1898 survey of London’s living conditions, Booths created a detailed “Poverty Map of London” which had colored sections representing his classifications of socio-economic types. The British public perceived his map to be evidence of the growing epidemic of destitute poverty, especially in the immigrant East End. Booths’ map also contained a new class of the poor, demarcated on the map with the color black, to denote a particularly heinous class of poverty, described as “a chronic state of want” and “vicious, semi-criminal.”\(^{249}\) The British public perceived that this criminally dangerous black portion of the population represented on Booths’ poverty map was spreading across London, and its marked association with the East End furthered the growing belief that immigrants were contaminating the nation with crime and poverty.

Many self-proclaimed experts on immigration, such as Major Sir William Evans-Gordon, a member of the 1903 Royal Commission on Alien Immigration and a Conservative MP for Stepney in the East End, used the new statistical reports to decry the poor morality and terrible

\(^{248}\) See Royal Commission on Alien Immigration Report, 1903.

\(^{249}\) Charles Booth, “Descriptive Map of London Poverty 1900,” 1902.
vices of immigrants. Such experts claimed that immigrants degraded the morality and character of England and worsened the living conditions of the English poor who were forced to live among them.\textsuperscript{250} Evans-Gordon published a 1903 book entitled \textit{The Alien Immigrant}, in which he blamed immigrants for England’s problems and used statistics from his time on the Royal Commission to support his accusations. He argued that the East End was being transformed into a foreign land: “When visiting the towns of Western Russia within the Jewish pale, I was surprised to find myself in the familiar surroundings of the East End.” Evans-Gordon wrote, “…the foreigners [are] coming in like locusts, eating up the English inhabitants or driving them out.” He also contended that immigrants were stealing British jobs, stating that in all of Britain “tradesmen are supplanted in their business and deprived of their living” by aliens.\textsuperscript{251} The British Brothers League, which formed in London in 1902 and opposed the waves of poor immigrants, also popularized and dramatized the statistics on immigration in their numerous demonstrations, speeches, and pamphlets and in their ubiquitous slogan “England for the English”.\textsuperscript{252}

Crime, poverty and many problems of the British urban slums became attributed to immigrants, causing the public and some Government officials to call for immigration reform, and consequently, the Aliens Act of 1905 was passed. In the Aliens Act of 1905 “undesirable” and “destitute” became categories that would deny immigrants entrance into England, and “alien ships”, defined as carrying at least twenty aliens, could be forced to unload passengers for an inspection. To illustrate that they were neither undesirable nor destitute, the bill required that

\textsuperscript{251} William Evans-Gordon, \textit{The Alien Immigrant}, 1903.
immigrants must show that they possessed at least five pounds to immigrate into England. However, an appeals procedure was put into place, and safeguards for religious and political refugees were included. Critics ridiculed the loopholes of the Aliens Act, such that an Anarchist need merely to travel on a non-immigrant ship or to steal five pounds to prove his worth, and railed against the appeals procedures and protections for political refugees, who were increasingly associated with Anarchists. Evans-Gordon queried of Home Secretary Gladstone in a 1906 House of Commons debate: “I beg to ask…whether, in the event of persons known to be anarchists arriving as immigrants in this country, the plea that they are political refugees is accepted as entitling them to admission.”

Although the Aliens Act of 1905 claimed to protect the nation from “undesirable and destitute immigrants,” which was intended to include Anarchists, the liberal Government of the time did not wish to endorse the harsher language and restrictions that would directly target Anarchists. Descriptions of immigrants of “notoriously bad character” that meant to preclude Anarchist types from entering England were struck from the bill due to liberal objection. The British public heavily criticized the bill arguing that the 1905 Aliens Act, similar to the failed attempts to control Anarchists through international cooperation, illustrated the Government’s grand illusion that Anarchists would not harm England because England provided them safe harbor. On 9 June 1906, in an article titled “THE ANARCHIST BEAST,” The Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science, and Art wrote, “...it is necessary in this country to reiterate that the anarchist is not a political assassin; he is merely a noxious beast...The need of the hour is not philosophical discussion; but the eradication of a pest.” The article further

254 H. o C. Debate, Hansards, 14 June 1906.
claimed that it was England’s objection to Anarchist repression that had prevented the international cooperation that had been agreed upon in the International Anti-Anarchist Conferences. According to the author, it would be “a misfortune for us all” when an Anarchist outrage planned in Britain was executed on the Continent, for such an atrocity would turn the wrath of Europe against England. The article contended that the only way to protect England was for the Government to cease their ridiculous discussions of rights and individuals and finally act against Anarchism: “The unhuman brute who wars on civilisation with poisoned weapons must be clearly marked out from humanity, and having been marked out must be hunted down.”

Thus, despite the Aliens Act of 1905 that was aimed to address the need for immigration reform, by 1909 the British public was acutely concerned over the growing number of immigrants in England and was calling for more stringent measures to restrict the entrance of potentially Anarchist and detrimental immigrants into England.

c. THE FIRST RUSSIAN REVOLUTION AND ITS PERCEIVED CONNECTION TO ANARCHISM

The outbreak of the First Russian Revolution in 1905 also contributed greatly to the British public’s fear of Anarchism and their burgeoning fear of immigrants as scores of Russian immigrants fled the ensuing violence. Following the assassination of the tsar in 1881, waves
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257 The 1901 census numbers were used by the newspapers and The Royal Commission on Alien Immigration Committee along with ship manifests. The next census did not come out until 1911, so the 1901 numbers (200,000 immigrants in 1901) are the numbers people used and debated from 1903 to 1910. More recent historical figures note that the influx was much smaller than feared at the time. For example, Russians and Poles accounted for only .3% of the population in England and Wales from 1901 (53,537) to 1911 (68,420), but they were highly concentrated – 80% of those lived in the Stepney borough of London. News reports made Russian immigration seem overwhelming even though German immigration at the time was actually higher. See *John Bull’s Island: Immigration and British Society, 1871-1971*, 1988.
of social and political discontent swept through Russia, creating a vast array of underground political bodies. In the early winter of 1905 strikes began throughout the country, and on 22 January 1905 government troops fired on the protestors, killing more than one hundred in an event that became labeled “Bloody Sunday.” Public indignation led to additional strikes in urban centers throughout the Russian Empire, where incidents of strikers being shot by guards became increasingly prevalent. By October of 1905 strikes across the country had debilitated much of the Russian Empire, with many services, such as railroads, often being non-existent. Radical groups that had previously simmered underground, such as the Social Revolutionary Party of Russia, initiated a program of violence, assassination and terrorist acts that spanned from 1904 to 1907 and killed thousands of civilians and more than 2500 government officials. In October 1905 the tsar was pressured into signing a manifesto that granted basic civil rights, allowed political parties, extended suffrage, and gave the Duma central legislative power, halting the major strikes almost immediately. However, these provisions were not followed through, and the tsar began a new era of punishing dissent with mass hangings and using artillery against his people, killing thousands, reportedly, and displacing many more. Though the Revolution ended in 1907, the radical groups who had surfaced during this time continued to organize, and tensions remained high under the increasingly severe autocratic rule of Tsar Nicholas II.

259 For more on the wave of Anarchist violence in Russia in and around the 1905 Revolution, see Paul Avrich, “Russian Anarchists and the Civil War” in Russian Review, July 1968; and Walter Laqueur, A History of Terrorism, 1997.
260 There are not exact figures for the number of Russian citizens killed in the First Russian Revolution, and many exaggerated numbers were printed in the press across Western Europe in the early twentieth century. The press claimed that there were many thousands of executions. The October pogrom directed against the Jewish population in Odessa (roughly 138,000 at the time) no doubt killed and displaced many from the Russian Pale of Settlement. See Edward H. Judge, Easter in Kishinev: Anatomy of a Pogrom, 1992; Benjamin Nathans, Beyond the Pale: The Jewish Encounter With Late Imperial Russia, 2004; and Jonathan Dekel-Chen, David Gaunt, Natan M. Meir, and Israel Bartal, Eds., Anti-Jewish Violence: Rethinking the Pogrom in East European History, 2010.
The English press reported heavily on the events in Russia, and it became the popular British conception that all of the radical groups in the First Russian Revolution were Anarchists. A 1905 article detailing a Russian Navy revolt labeled the striking soldiers as Anarchists and stated, “Thus the strongholds of the navy like those of the army continue steadfast in their resistance to the incessant siege of the revolutionary anarchist.” The article referred to the revolt as “wild lawless acts of infuriated strikers and assassins goaded on by anarchists.” The Times, too, represented the Russian revolutionaries as Anarchists: “…the revolutionary disturbances have often assumed an anarchical character…with the total disrespect of religion, human life, and the rights of property.” Even popular fiction perpetuated the connection between the First Russian Revolution and Anarchism. A 1907 book, The Little Anarchist by Arthur W. Marchmont, told of a familiar and frequently repeated tale in England in the years following the First Russian Revolution. The story, which took place in Russia during the Revolution, followed a square jawed Englishman and his Russian princess lover as they navigated a perilous landscape rife with Anarchist bombs, spies, and Tsarist tyranny.

By labeling the radical groups fighting in the First Russian Revolution as Anarchists, the British public dismissed all of the radical groups as legitimate political entities. Just as Anarchists in France and England were dismissed as dissidents without a valid political cause, so, too, were the radical groups of the Russian Revolution dismissed, due to the public’s perceived connection between these groups and Anarchism. Of particular note, Bolsheviks also became confused with Anarchists during this time and were likewise discredited. England had
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263 The Times, 28 August 1905.
265 When Bolsheviks came into power during World War I this existing association with Anarchism created a tremendous fear of Bolsheviks within Britain. Due to the correlation between Anarchism and Bolshevism, Britons were suspicious of Bolsheviks, believing them to be a ruthless and amoral people, and England feared that the doctrine of Bolshevism would spread out of Russia in the same manner that the disease of Anarchism had spread. As
no sympathy for Tsar Nicholas II, however, as the British public widely believed that the tsars’ unjust, autocratic rule had bred the angry and violent Anarchists, ultimately holding him responsible for much of the duress the Russian Empire was facing.

During the First Russian Revolution numerous reports circulated through the British presses of Anarchists kidnapping political figures and stealing valuables to acquire funds to further their cause. A story on the First Russian Revolution espoused by the literary magazine Macmillan’s Magazine criticized the failure of the Revolution and condemned its results upon the Russian people, stating, “There loom on the horizon the organizations of the Terrorists and Anarchists, which collect money promiscuously by threat and blackmail.” Macmillan’s Magazine claimed that Anarchists harmed both the rich and the poor alike as they kidnapped and stole from their peers and neighbors to fund their efforts. Reports of such lowly and criminal behavior led to the development of a ‘Russian-type’ stereotype of Anarchists that emerged in the popular press. In June of 1906 the Illustrated London News published a special article titled, “The Terror of Kings at Work: Quasi-Scientific Anarchy” to discuss the ‘Russian-type’ Anarchist. According to the Illustrated London News, the ‘Russian-type’ was unlike other Anarchists and was much more fierce, determined and cruel than your standard French or Italian Anarchist:

Anyone who knows “the Russian mind” knows that “when he has flung his bomb, he rarely seeks to flee.” Unlike the simpler, weaker Euro Anarchists who “…strike and then to escape public vengeance, such is, I take it, the plan of the French Anarchist, and my opinion accords with the examination of Anarchist crimes which have succeeded in France...It was the idea of flight which made their hands tremble and their sight dim...These [Euro]
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Macmillan’s Magazine, June 1906.
Anarchists, self-styled men of justice, lack spirit for their job: they are too nervous...They lack technical knowledge also.\textsuperscript{267}

Compared to the weaker French, Spanish and Italian ‘Euro Anarchists,’ the ‘Russian-type’ Anarchist was viewed as unusually powerful and formidable with a particular penchant for the chemistry of bomb-making. The standard ‘Euro Anarchist’ was believed to cause comparatively minimal damage with his bomb, while a more skilled and malevolent ‘Russian-type’ Anarchist would create a significantly more deadly explosion due to his inhumanity and knowledge of chemistry.

With the number of immigrants entering London from Russia and Eastern Europe tripling in the years during and immediately following the First Russian Revolution\textsuperscript{268} the British public’s concern over potentially Anarchist immigrants, especially the highly feared ‘Russian-type’ Anarchist, intensified. Englanders began to believe that the nation was importing especially violent and powerful Anarchists into its borders. This fear was exacerbated on 31 January 1905 when the violence in Russia migrated to France; Anarchists placed a bomb on the doorstep of the Military Attaché of the Russian Embassy in Paris, and another bomb exploded shortly thereafter on a footpath near a Paris shop.\textsuperscript{269} In 1906 \textit{The Times} reported on an interview with Sir Howard Vincent, MP and former Director of Criminal Investigation in London, where Vincent stated, “France expels [Anarchists] to Belgium, while Germany, Russia, and Belgium all expel [Anarchists] to England…But we have no right, I maintain, to allow England or our great metropolis to be the refuge of foreign anarchists or the plotting place of outrages…”\textsuperscript{270} As Anarchist tensions in Russia and elsewhere on the Continent continued to grow, Britons became

\textsuperscript{267} \textit{Illustrated London News}, 9 June 1906.  
\textsuperscript{269} \textit{The Times}, 1 February 1905. For background on these bombings see John Merriman, \textit{The Dynamite Club: How a Bombing in Fin-de-Siècle Paris Ignited the Age of Modern Terror}, 2009.  
\textsuperscript{270} Interview with Sir Howard Vincent, MP and former Director of Criminal Investigation in London and one of the British Representatives to the 1898 Anti-Anarchist Conference. \textit{The Times}, 5 June 1906.
increasingly concerned that it was only a matter of time until the Anarchists hiding in England as political refugees and immigrants began to scorn the freedom England afforded them and began perpetuating violence and lawlessness within the nation.

ii. ANARCHISM BEGINS TO REPRESENT THE ANXIETIES OF THE EDWARDIAN ERA

In the years between the Greenwich Outrage in 1894 and the Tottenham Outrage in 1909, the public discussion of Anarchism flourished in the press, and despite the lack of British Anarchist outrages during this time, many new conclusions and stereotypes were propagated throughout the British media. These ideas blossomed out of the notions of disease and contagion spawned by the Greenwich Outrage and built upon the fears of the time, namely Anarchist assassinations abroad and throngs of poor Russian immigrants fuelling pre-existing immigration concerns, until the British people created a new danger, referred to as extreme individualism, that Englanders feared would bring about the downfall of the nation.

While the idea that Anarchists were fundamentally different and diseased people was widely accepted after the Greenwich Observatory bombing, the string of Anarchist assassinations and the brutal ferocity of the First Russian Revolution in the years between 1894 and 1909 firmly labeled Anarchists as bad, amoral, and diseased people in the public mind. Combining seemingly copious evidence to substantiate the claim that Anarchists were depraved, diseased people with the overwhelming confidence in science at the turn of the century, the British public no longer questioned or debated the validity of such a label. In their minds, the scientific data had spoken, and the scientific community, often viewed as omniscient at the time, had declared
Anarchists a different breed of human and a disease upon civilized mankind. Thus, all further discussions of Anarchists were taken as a dialogue on people who were a malevolent contagion and fundamentally different from the English.

a. THE EMERGENCE OF THE RUSSIAN ANARCHIST STEREOTYPE

The First Russian Revolution spawned the development of the ‘Russian-type’ Anarchist, who was either was an extremely powerful and animalistic physical specimen or was a shrewd and sadistic mastermind. In an 1898 article in *Review of Reviews*, titled “Russia and the Russians,” an Englishman described the unusually impressive physique of the Russian people: “...they are a fine race physically, the men being stout and strong and often big, while the young women are as promising, from the important view of motherhood...”\(^{271}\) In 1900 *Illustrated Chips* initiated a serial that perpetuated ‘Russian-type’ Anarchist stereotypes through their sensationalist tales of Anarchists plots and intrigue across Europe. In these tales, Russian Anarchists were portrayed as either simple but physically potent ruffians or as cunning masterminds.\(^{272}\) The *English Illustrated Magazine* supported the Anarchist mastermind stereotype, claiming, “…the masters who invented Anarchism were men of letters, men of science, and so-called philosophers,”\(^{273}\) and the Russian ambassador who orchestrated the plot in Conrad’s *The Secret Agent* epitomized the stereotype of the Russian mastermind, an all-knowing individual who manipulated people as if they were pawns on a chessboard. W.C. Hart’s 1906 book, *Confessions of an Anarchist*, also supported the stereotype of the Anarchist mastermind,
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\(^{271}\) *Review of Reviews*, June 1898.
\(^{273}\) *English Illustrated Magazine*, November 1901. p. 187.
claiming that one tenth of Anarchists were leaders, men of capable intellect and ferocity who
directed the Anarchist movement.\textsuperscript{274}

W. C. Hart wrote of another type of Anarchist, however, and this, he claimed, was the
most common Anarchist. According to Hart, nine tenths of Anarchists were “weak-minded or
criminally-inclined person[s]” who rallied under Anarchist theory because it masked their
criminal instincts.\textsuperscript{275} This type of Anarchist, one of feeble mind who did not plan but instead did
as he was told, became known as the ‘dupe-type’ of Anarchist. The ‘Russian-type’ Anarchist
contradicted with the ‘dupe-type’ Anarchist. While the ‘Russian-type’ was viewed as an
Anarchist mastermind or as an elite soldier, the ‘dupe-type’ Anarchist was viewed as the
untrained soldier. ‘Dupe-type’ Anarchists were also considered much more malleable and
weaker than the ‘Russian-type’. They were not particularly intelligent and were at the mercy of
their masters. Notably, the ‘dupe-type’ Anarchist could be from any country, including England.

Steevie, from Conrad’s \textit{The Secret Agent}, was an excellent example of the ‘dupe-type’ Anarchist.
He enjoyed the violence and chaos Anarchism brought; therefore, he followed the instructions of
his superiors and committed terrible acts, yet he understood little of what he was doing. The
scientific journal \textit{The Lancet} supported the stereotypes of the Anarchist mastermind and the
Anarchist dupe, writing, "But the head and front of the evil is the propagandist, the man of
culture and education who scatters his glib vapourings about property and the rights of man...yet
the miserable beings who translate these theories into acts are the poor who are bred in misery
and nurtured in hopelessness."\textsuperscript{276}

\textit{The Lancet} article referenced above and the ‘dupe-type’ Anarchist stereotype highlight a
secondary reason for the British public’s fear of Anarchists. Undoubtedly, Britons feared that

\textsuperscript{275} W.C. Hart, \textit{Confessions of an Anarchist}, 1906, pp. 135.
\textsuperscript{276} \textit{The Lancet}, 14 September 1901.
Russian immigrants were actually cunning and physically powerful Anarchists capable of
terrible violence. However, the British public also feared Anarchists, especially those of the
‘Russian-type,’ for their rhetoric and propaganda. Englanders worried that the unrealistic claims
and the idealism of Anarchist preachings, under the skillful guise of an Anarchist mastermind,
would seduce England’s disillusioned and dissatisfied poor, the uneducated masses, into
becoming Anarchist ‘dupes.’ These people, either poor English citizens or previously peaceful
immigrants, could become brainwashed by the promises of Anarchism and could be coerced into
committing terrible acts. Steevie, from Conrad’s *The Secret Agent*, illustrated this spreading of
Anarchist rhetoric from the Russian masterminds to the ‘dupes’ until it eventually infected an
Englishman, who although was not very intelligent himself, could have inflicted great harm.
Thus, the British public worried that through the ‘dupe-type’ of Anarchist the contagion of
Anarchism would spread from immigrants and masterminds throughout the poor of England,
eventually infecting their own British citizens.  

b. THE EMERGENCE OF EXTREME INDIVIDUALISM

The most significant change in British public opinion that occurred from 1895 to 1908
was regarding the public’s stance on individualism. In the Victorian era, the romantic, free-
spirited notion of individualism advocated by John Stuart Mill flourished. John Stuart Mill
praised the individual because he was the goal of human society. According to his book, *On
Liberty*, the freedom of the individual was paramount; it was what separated man from the
beasts. Only in the cases where one individual’s freedom impinged upon or reduced the

277 See Joseph Conrad, *The Secret Agent*, 1907. For an example of the above fears in England over Anarchist
propaganda, see the *Economist*, 22 October 1898.
freedoms of others, should that individual’s freedom be curtailed: “[T]he sole end for which mankind are warranted, individually or collectively in interfering with the liberty of action of any of their number, is self-protection…The only part of the conduct of any one, for which he is amenable to society, is that which concerns others. In the part which merely concerns himself, his independence is, of right, absolute. Over himself, over his own body and mind, the individual is sovereign.”

In short, England in the Victorian era believed that freedom was an inalienable right of man, as long as that freedom did not come at the cost of other men.

However, at the turn of the century, Britons worried that a new form of individualism was emerging – extreme individualism. In extreme individualism, individuals were only concerned with themselves and had no regard for how their actions affected others. In John Stuart Mill’s individualism, individuals advanced their own causes only so long as their cause did not harm their fellow man. In extreme individualism, individuals did not care whether their actions adversely affected others; they cared only for their own gain. Under extreme individualism, an individual’s freedom could become dangerous because it had the potential to harm the welfare of the remainder of the population. In this scenario, individualism was not something to be aspired for but rather something to be fearful of. Unlike the Victorian era where the freedoms and rights of individuals were celebrated as signs of progress in society, at the turn of the century the British public was beginning to view individual freedoms as dangerous, old-fashioned flaws of British society that had the potential to bring chaos and destruction to the nation.

Not surprisingly, Anarchists were the preeminent example of extreme individuals at the turn of the century. In 1902 The Westminster Review surveyed Anarchism and concluded that
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Anarchism was, at its core, nothing more than “unfettered individualism.” Even before 1902, Anarchism and extreme individualism were inexorably linked, even if only in the description of the groups’ members. Both Anarchists and extreme individuals were labeled with the same characteristics and temperaments. Their faults and their manner of conducting business were synonymous. Extreme individuals and Anarchists were lazy, unreasonable, and selfish individuals who desired rewards without work and cared nothing of their actions’ effects on others. These individuals reveled in mayhem and destruction. Their goal was chaos and devastation. *The Halfpenny Marvel* published a fictional story in 1897 about an extreme individual, a character called Baxter Hyndman: “There was always something peculiar about Baxter Hyndman. He was particularly selfish, peculiarly lazy, peculiarly deficient in all manly qualities - in fact, he was just the sort of man to become an up-to-date Anarchist.” Although Baxter Hyndman was never explicitly labeled an Anarchist in the story, the parallels between Baxter Hyndman and Anarchist stereotypes were readily transparent. In the story, Baxter Hyndman built a bomb of his own design, which he flaunted publicly, and drunkenly boasted that either himself or someone else would eventually utilize the bomb, crying out, “And think of the honour! I tell you...it is worth risking a great deal to be a public character!”

Baxter Hyndman highlighted another key aspect of extreme individuals – their vanity and desire for fame. Both Anarchists and extreme individuals, at the time, were perceived to be motivated not by political gain but by their own selfishness and want of renown. *The Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science, and Art* stated, “…all of the anarchists who have been captured exhibit that extraordinary mixture of vanity and ferocity…” and “…in all the [Anarchists] in question there is one marked feature always present, and that is a diseased vanity
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swollen to proportions of madness.”282 When reporting on the growing number of Anarchist assassinations, *The Outlook* claimed, “We dismiss them as madmen but that just lets us stick our heads in the sand - notoriety is what fuels them.” The article discussed the potent lure that fame and notoriety could present for men and advocated that newspapers should be prohibited from reporting on any Anarchist outrages to avoid slaking the Anarchist’s perverse desire for fame. It concluded that fame was a powerful motivator, stating, “Very good and very great men have flung away their lives for that same guerdon. Why not [the Anarchist], though he be neither good nor great?”283

Once the new class of extreme individuals had been defined, the British public turned to speculation on how such nefarious individuals were created. Many of the explanations were founded on disease psychology and claimed that extreme individuals, such as Anarchists, were either born aberrant or were created through illness. The *Economist* weighed in on the debate, stating,

…the typical anarchist is, we take it, a man of stunted nature both of head and heart, with dangerous criminal tendencies. Sometimes these tendencies are due to feeble intellect, but they are more often due to a deeply-rooted vicious nature, which finds delight in abnormal acts abhorrent to all right-minded people…Anarchism is partly the outcome of insanity, partly of crime, and there is a curious blending of the two elements, modern criminology having undoubtedly established the close connection between certain forms of mental and of moral disease.284

The book, *Anarchism: A Criticism and History of the Anarchist Theory*, one of the most comprehensive analyses of Anarchists at the turn of the century, also contended an abnormal mental component to Anarchist proclivities, stating, “We will not enter the controversial province of criminal pathology, although it seems certain that in the criminal deeds of the
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Anarchist of action, a large share is taken by persons pathologically diseased or mentally affected.”

285 The Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science, and Art likened extreme individuals to a contagious disease: “It has become a disease which is transmitted from one mad anarchist to another as hydrophobia is transmitted from one mad dog to another; and the mad dog and the mad anarchist have about the same capacity of reasoning…”

Other accounts posited an environmental explanation and argued that extreme individuals were created by poverty, culture, or forms of government. Reverend W. B. Duggan argued in his sermons that society was responsible for the emergence of extreme individuals, such as Anarchists. He claimed that society had mistreated the poor and uneducated masses, thus driving them into becoming Anarchists: “…Anarchism, that bundle of animosities which prompts the destruction one by one of the heads of organized society, is generally the result of the neglect of primary social duties on the part of the whole body of that society…”

287 The Bristol Mercury and Daily Post also held poverty liable, claiming, “A man who considers death to be annihilation and whose life is a continual struggle against destitution will easily develop into a rabid anarchist…”

Several reports contended that modern Western culture was the source of extreme individuals. They believed that the free press and the liberal ideology of western countries perpetuated Anarchist tendencies. The Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science, and Art argued that the British media was nurturing the vanity of extreme individuals by covering their crimes in such lurid detail and attributed the ideology of the Victorian era for Anarchists’ delusions. According to the article, “They have inherited the principles of the eighteenth-century

287 Jackson’s Oxford Journal, 11 August 1900.
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revolutionaries, who believed in the goodness of human nature to such an extravagant degree that they thought if it were not for oppressive government men would love each other as brothers, and carry on the world on cooperative principles without needing any restraint by force."

Some reports blamed declining church attendance and diminished faith in religion for the emergence of extreme individuals. *The Bristol Mercury and Daily Post* attributed the growth of Anarchism in Italy to religion: “This bloodthirsty race has, as a rule, no moral restraint, because the inevitable antagonism between Church and State has reduced religion to a very low ebb in a very large section of the masses...people are drifting into materialism and its attendant carpe diem doctrines: a disregard of every duty that cannot be enforced, immorality, crime.”

In 1901, the *English Illustrated Magazine* even blamed education and literature for the Anarchist problem: “...we have been learning that Anarchy beget Anarchism and that Anarchism is a literary disease. Culture, instead of curing it, may propagate the fatal microbe; indeed, without some degree of culture it can hardly be said to exist. At all events, the masters who invented Anarchism were men of letters, men of science, and so-called philosophers.”

The author argued that writers had romanticized the ideas of Bakunin, and novelists and poets had glorified the natures of Anarchists, namely their vanity and struggle for fame.

Many British citizens believed that tyrannical governments, such as those in Italy and Russia, perpetuated extreme individuals. The association between Anarchists and the First Russian Revolution further intensified the perceived link between extreme individuals and oppressive governmental regimes. *Anarchism: A Criticism and History of the Anarchist Theory* claimed that readers must eschew the theory that Anarchism was simple madness for a deeper understanding of its logic. The book asserted that Anarchism fed on certain external factors,
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such as government repression, which turned the minds of workers into hardened and undirected anger. Despite great objections from many, the book condemned strategies to curtail Anarchism through stricter government intervention and harsher policing: “A movement like Anarchism cannot be conquered by force and injustice, but only by justice and freedom.”

Conversely, in 1900, *Fortnightly* argued that democracy was the reason for Anarchism rather than the solution: “Anarchism is not a disease, but a crime, and a crime of the most infamous nature; but it is a symptom of disease, and that disease is Democracy.” The author argued that England had not placed enough checks and balances into their democratic government and was, therefore, at particular risk to Anarchism: “A nation wholly abandoned to the heady lawlessness of Democracy is stricken to its very vitals with a deadly and incurable malady. Such a nation is a spectacle over which the gods might well weep tears of pity. And such a spectacle is England to-day.” According to the article, democracy bred envy; men would rather other men be poor than anyone be wealthier than them. It claimed, “Envy, [is] perhaps the most fiendish passion that can animate the human breast.”

This article posited that democratic governments propagated envious citizens, who became extreme individuals, which, according to the author, explained the rise of radical groups, such as Socialists and Anarchists, in democratic nations. In the wake of such divergent theories on the origin of extreme individuals and the uncertainty regarding what role their political system played in their development, many Britons remained undecided on the question of what created extreme individuals, such as Anarchists. Did the tyrannical government in countries, such as Russia, generate extreme individuals, or was the harsh political system in Russia a necessary evil to regulate the selfish and extreme individuals who lived there?
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c. THE ENGLISH PUBLIC PERCEIVES THAT EXTREME INDIVIDUALS ARE A DANGER TO THE NATION

As a result of the extensive and convoluted discourse regarding extreme individuals, their characteristics, and their origins, an ‘us versus them’ mentality evolved within Britain. This mentality compiled all extreme individuals, Socialists, Anarchists, Irish, and Suffragettes, into one group and the remainder of society into another group. The group that comprised ‘civilized’ society, one free from dangerous extremists, represented a singular and united element and was of indeterminate size. The ‘civilized’ group could represent England, London, the West, or even all of civilization. As long as the entity in question was pitted against extreme individuals, such as Anarchists, the group symbolized one cohesive unit, despite the increasingly small discrepancies in the opinions and beliefs of its constituents. An article titled, “ANARCHISM AND ATHEISM,” illustrated the ‘us versus them’ mentality that was emerging in the mind of the English public: “…all reasonable and sane men believe in a god of some sort, but not Anarchists…” 294 Another article furthered the separation between the civilized populous and extreme individuals, declaring, “The unhuman brute who wars on civilisation with poisoned weapons must be clearly marked out from humanity…” 295 Such inclusive and decisive rhetoric against extreme individuals engendered a united front in the fight against extremists, such as Anarchists. While the British public still possessed many varying and often contradictory beliefs on the topic of extreme individuals, the British people were resolute and unified in their goal of identifying and eradicating extreme individuals.

The growing number of pronouncements which stirred and unified the British public in their mission against extreme individuals instilled a war-like mentality in public opinion. Newspapers began calling for everyday citizens to act in their own neighborhoods to protect the public from Anarchists, and it was widely perceived that the police and Government were ill-prepared to handle the Anarchist menace. *The Illustrated Police News, etc.* informed their readers: “Their hands are not only raised against Monarchs, but against every form of civilised Government…Their suppression or extermination is an urgent necessity...” The *Pall Mall Gazette* reported on a rumor of an Anarchist meeting upcoming in Trafalgar square, stating, “We agree entirely...that the Anarchist meeting should not take place. That the wicked nonsense of [Anarchists] or any other foreign scape-hemp will gain the cause a single recruit from among the British working-classes is, of course, inconceivable.” The same article referred to Anarchists as “infamous scoundrels who have deliberately declared war upon every institution and every ordinance.” In 1901 *Fortnightly* published a scathing critique of the British Government in an article titled “AN UNARMED PEOPLE.” According to the article, the Government’s failure to control Anarchists in England demonstrated that Britain was not prepared for war. The article also asserted that England lacked the structure, resources, and laws necessary to produce modern weapons and was lagging behind other countries in possessing the mentality and tactics required for modern warfare.

Such inflammatory statements fueled pre-existing concerns that extreme individuals, such as Anarchists, had the potential to bring about the end of the British Empire and the ruin of the nation. A popular fictional story of Anarchists, known as “The Devilry of Baron Krantz,” cycled through the British presses and illustrated England’s fear that Anarchism might destroy the
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nation. In the story, a wealthy Englishman was sentenced to jail where he discovered Anarchism, and as he was eager to inflict his revenge on England for his lost status and title, he concocted a plan to abolish London. He utilized his wealth to build a massive underground station that diverted the Thames into a volcano deep below the heart of London. When the water of the Thames encountered the volcano an enormous explosion of steam destroyed London:

Another series of shocks caused us both to reel violently, and vast clouds of dust and smoke, from burning and dismantled houses in the distance, swept across the road, nearly blinding us. The air seemed to tremble with the shrieks of the injured, the shouts of men and lamentations of women, the howls of dogs, and the rattle and roar of collapsing buildings in the distance...whole blocks of buildings shoot into the air crushing great swarms of people like jelly...

Ultimately, thousands of British civilians were killed by the explosion, and London was razed to the ground, yet Baron Krantz and his Anarchist followers escaped. The fear that extreme individuals, such as Anarchists, could destroy the nation intensified after an Anarchist pamphlet was distributed in the East End during the Queen’s Jubilee procession through the East End to Victoria Park, while guarded by a vast battery of nearly 5,000 troops, reportedly the most to march along the streets of London since the days of Queen Elizabeth. Although the police frantically scoured the streets to collect the repulsive pamphlet, hundreds of English citizens read the plea firsthand and thousands read the following the next day in the press.

Fellow Citizens, -- We have no desire to disturb the few remaining years of life of a fat old woman – evidently destined by nature for the wash-tub, but elevated by fortune to a throne - but when we are asked to rejoice that ‘God! has been pleased to spare her’ to rob and plunder the starving millions of some £60,000,000 for sixty years, it is the duty of all honest men to make a protest...Irishmen, remember Gallagher, Whitehead, Dovaney, driven mad by brutal blows, the dark cells, and diabolical cruelty. Will you cheer the monsters whose hired murderers have done this
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devilish work? Let them be greeted by a roar of curses and execrations. Down with the landlords and sweaters! To the devil with despots and rulers! To Hell with the whole show!” signed “The London Revolutionists”  

Not only did the Anarchists distributing the pamphlet aim to incite the dissatisfied poor, and even the Irish, into rebelling against the Government, but these Anarchists were able to distribute their pamphlet without any recourse by the State during one of England’s most significant, and heavily guarded, State functions, thereby affirming the stealth and power of Anarchists, even when dealing with the highest levels of Government.

Anarchists were not the only ones to notice potential similarities between other violent, political groups, such as the Irish, and themselves. The wider public also perceived many similarities between Anarchists and the numerous violent, radical groups that were emerging in Britain at the turn of the twentieth century. The Irish, the Boers, the Suffragettes, and the radical Socialists, including the Syndicalists, were groups that were increasing in both number and notoriety around 1900. Their increasingly violent attacks on the State were drawing greater attention from the British public, and before long, all of these groups, Irish, Boers, Suffragettes, radical Socialists, and Syndicalists, were labeled as extreme individuals. The Monthly Review compared Boers to Anarchists, stating that like the Anarchist, “…the Boer is a man who has been two hundred years an outlaw - who has been suckled in principles which we count as treasonable.”

The same framework that was utilized to understand Anarchists as extreme individuals was applied to understand these radical groups, as well. As a result, these radical groups were denounced as illegitimate ideologies and were marginalized and discredited. An article condemning Suffragettes wrote,
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The fallacy of Anarchism may be signalised in a word as the idolisation of the abstract notion of liberty...But the Anarchist is by no means the only person who is guilty of the idolisation of the abstract formula as such, and who is prepared to sacrifice thereto concrete considerations of social welfare...those “woman-sentimentalists” who believe in the notion of gender equality as an absolute have no practical consideration of division of skills (like nursing a baby is not to be shared equally).  

In a 1901 article titled, “ASSASSINATION: A FRUIT OF SOCIALISM,” the McKinley assassination, though widely attributed to Anarchists, was blamed instead on Socialism, stating that one cannot discriminate between Anarchism and Socialism because democracy had generated both radical groups. Thus, all extreme individuals, be they Anarchists, Suffragettes, or Socialists, were discredited as diseased, abnormal, and deranged individuals who wanted only fame and notoriety and cared nothing for the welfare of society, ready to destroy their neighbors to obtain their own selfish interests.

d. THE BRITISH PUBLIC PERCEIVES THAT ANARCHISTS ARE ENTERING ENGLAND DISGUISED AS IMMIGRANTS

The impassioned debates over immigration that surrounded the Aliens Act of 1905 and the tens of thousands of Eastern European immigrants fleeing the First Russian Revolution further intensified fears of Anarchists in England. The British public worried that England’s lax immigration laws were granting Anarchists a safe haven within England’s boarders. As Anarchists were becoming increasingly associated with immigrants, political refugees, and Russians, the British public became increasingly convinced that Anarchists were flooding into Britain under the guise of immigration and political asylum. Even Parliament was beguiled by
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the slew of press articles that asserted that Anarchists were entering the country as political
refugees; Parliament questioned the press regarding their reports on dangerous Anarchists
entering the nation via political asylum to determine if the reports were true.305

The association between immigrants and Anarchists was intensifying from 1895-1908,
and the British press and the public were increasingly labeling immigrants as Anarchists,
regardless of their actual political affiliations. By the end of 1908, immigrants were regularly
referred to as ‘Russian’ or ‘Anarchist,’ despite their actual nationality or beliefs, and discussions
on immigration began to overlay the concerns that surrounded Russian immigrants onto all
immigrants. An article in the Pall Mall Gazette repeatedly referred to all immigrants as “the
anarchist brood” and insisted that immigrants, especially political refugees, were unsafe: “The
foreign population, however, contains a proportion of potential outrage-mongers…[Asylum] was
never intended to cover infamous scoundrels…”306 Thus, as Anarchists were viewed as
progressively more dangerous entities, so too were immigrants perceived as increasingly
dangerous. Fears regarding Anarchist immigrants were typically categorized into one of the
three concerns – unusually dangerous Anarchists were immigrating into England from Russia,
England was a hub for Anarchist planning, and immigrants would destroy the nation.

The ferocity and violence of the First Russian Revolution led the British public to believe
that Russian Anarchists were unusually powerful and fierce. Numerous reports claimed that
Anarchist assassinations abroad were often conducted by Russian or Eastern European
Anarchists, and such reports validated the idea that Russian Anarchists were abnormally capable
and ruthless.307 Critics of England’s lax immigration laws argued that England’s acceptance of
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Russian immigrants was not assisting innocent political refugees escaping tyranny but was instead embracing particularly noxious Russian Anarchists. The *Review of Reviews* alleged that Anarchists were the refuse and the criminals of Russia and that Anarchists had obliterated any value in the Russian Revolution through their campaign of terror. The article also alleged that such brutal Russians were the immigrants that England was welcoming into its borders: “On the class of Russians who seek asylum in London fleeing the wrath of the Tsar - they are a particular kind of Russian, like the criminally disposed Italian or Frenchman…Though we do not breed anarchists, we give them a willing shelter; and if the anarchists reward our hospitality by flinging elsewhere the bombs which they make in London, we are in a sense accessories to their crimes.”\(^{308}\) Thus, in the years between the Greenwich and the Tottenham Outrages, the British people became increasingly concerned that the thousands of Russians immigrating into England every year where not only Anarchists but were especially violent and ruthless Anarchists.

The British public, as well as many officials and supposed experts, also claimed that Anarchists were utilizing England as a base to plan Anarchist outrages on the Continent. They believed that England’s lax immigration laws allowed Anarchists to travel freely in and out of England and carry out their crimes without detection. Several of these experts asserted that England was the primary hub for Anarchist planning throughout Europe and that Anarchists were utilizing Britain’s liberal freedoms to concoct their schemes in safety. Once the Anarchists were dangerously armed for action, England’s lax immigration laws allowed them to easily travel to the European nation that they wished to enact their terrible vengeance upon. *The Daily News*, in 1897, was one of the first press agencies to make this claim when it reported that the Chief of Police in Barcelona had been shot by an Anarchist who had recently spent time in
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By 1900, *Illustrated Chips* had published a serial titled “The Red Ring; Or, The Foes of the World. The Revelations of an Anarchist Spy” that entranced readers with sensational tales of plots, intrigue, and plans of Anarchist violence. In this serial Anarchist masterminds and simple ruffians embarked on deadly missions throughout Europe, supported by an immense international ring of Anarchists based in London. Despite the larger than life nature of the players and the plots, the serial assured audiences that, to their knowledge, the events in the tales were true and accurate depictions of actual Anarchist plots. In 1908, Max Pemberton’s book, *Wheels of Anarchy: The Story of an Assassin*, also planted Anarchist centers in England. In the fictional tale, he told the story of a Canadian millionaire who devoted himself and his fortune to fighting Anarchists around the world and ultimately found himself in England fighting Anarchists on their home soil. As 1908 drew to a close, the British public was beginning to believe that Anarchists, while seemingly quiet in Britain, were actually quite numerous in England, hiding in their midst and plotting their dastardly deeds in obscurity.

The general English public at the turn of the century also began to hypothesize on the possibility that immigrants could imperil the nation. The most obvious way that Anarchists might harm the nation was through the assassination of political leaders. The *Economist* gave its opinion on this topic, concurring that Anarchists were indeed a threat to England’s heads of State: “[The Anarchist] broods on the misery of the world, and...admit of an easy solution...killing the persons who appear to enjoy the best time, and to be the chief upholders of the existing system of society.”
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The other and more insidious way that the British public feared that immigrants would endanger the nation was by overrunning England. Many Britons feared that the large numbers of immigrants in England would transform England into a country that the native inhabitants no longer knew. They feared that the poor morality, vices, and crimes attributed to immigrants would ruin English cities and lead to a wholesale degeneration of the nation and its values. The *Pall Mall Gazette* claimed that aliens lowered working conditions, corrupted morals, and physically infected the English with foreign diseases and ideas: “If the alien will take this starvation wage, as he will, the native has come down to it, or go without work altogether. That and the degradation of a life already horrible enough, caused by the infection of these people's presence, are surely a case for a resolute grasping of the nettle.” The *Pall Mall Gazette*, like many other papers, concluded that immigrants degraded the daily life of British citizens and speculated that this could contaminate the British nation over time.313

e. THE BRITISH PUBLIC BELIEVES THAT ANARCHISM NECESSitates GREATER STATE INVOLVEMENT

With the growing fear that Anarchist immigrants might beget the decline of the nation, Britons became ever more convinced that State was responsible for policing Anarchists and other extreme individuals. Many critics felt that the State was not doing enough to control extreme individuals, such as Anarchists, and voiced these criticisms quite loudly in the press. The *Manchester Times* condemned Scotland Yard when writing on the continued presence of extreme individuals in England, stating, “This naturally will lead to the inquiry as to why the governments do not employ competent men for police duty, at any rate in dealing with the
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Anarchist movement, or, failing that, why society itself, with its boundless resources of capital and of clever men of leisure, does not organize some species of association for its protection, and for the purpose of combating Anarchy, Nihilism, and the kindred movements against law and order.”

The Illustrated Police News, etc. blamed the State, calling for increased Government action against Anarchists following the assassination of Umberto I of Italy: “Prevention is better than cure, and the guardians of our lives and liberties should not wait for another abominable crime to goad them on…”

Eschewing the liberal ideologies of the previous century, the English public advocated the establishment of stricter, more interventionist policies to regulate the actions of extreme individuals.

Many members of the British public believed that the danger presented by Anarchists was so great that it necessitated sacrificing at least a small degree of liberty to be able to control such extreme individuals. The Economist claimed, “…some sacrifice of freedom is the price we must pay for social purity...mere formal liberty is of less value than substantial protection of life and goods. We must, therefore, count on a partial surrender of liberty so long as Europe is the seat of lawless violence and criminal anarchy.”

Sir Robert Anderson also advocated harsher penalties and reduced freedoms; although he focused his restrictions on the rights of immigrants, declaring in a 1901 article, “The only ‘inalienable right’ in the matter is that of the community to deprive any man of his liberty, and, if expedient, even of his life, if he deliberately pursues a course of conduct which is incompatible with the ‘life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness’ of others.”
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Despite such conservative stirrings by segments of the British population, the British Government did not concur that the State was responsible for policing Anarchists, nor did it support restricting individual liberties. In a 1900 speech Lord Salisbury denied the Government’s responsibility and instead invoked people of Britain to arm themselves and defend their neighborhoods, proclaiming, “…the defense of this country is not the business of the War Office or of the Government, but of the people themselves.”

Although the Aliens Act of 1905, which limited immigrants to those who possessed at least five pounds or arrived via first- or second-class tickets, was endorsed as an attempt to strengthen the perceived weaknesses in British immigration laws, it encountered fierce debate in Parliament and, ultimately, became emblematic of England’s immigration problems rather than a solution. The Aliens Act of 1905 had meager restrictions that few in the British public believed severely curtailed immigration. Certainly, the Aliens Act did not preclude the entrance of dangerous immigrants, such as Anarchists, and it enshrined the sanctity of the political refugee in Britain. Despite the public’s widespread belief that the Aliens Act of 1905 was too weak, many politicians believed that the Aliens Act was too restrictive. Winston Churchill, like many of his contemporaries, supported the Liberal Party when he voted against the Aliens Act of 1905. He decreed in Parliament that the State’s duty was to protect individual rights, including the rights of “the simple immigrants, the political refugee, the helpless and the poor.”
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318 Lord Salisbury’s “Primrose League Speech,” May 1900.
319 *The Times*, 31 May 1904.
iii. THE GAP YEARS CONCLUSION

Although the years between 1895 and 1908 saw no Anarchist violence in Britain, the British public’s fear of Anarchists continued to grow during this time. Anarchist violence on the Continent flourished in this period. A rash of Anarchist assassinations eliminated dozens of government officials and heads of state, and horrifying reports of death and destruction emerged from the First Russian Revolution, which the British media attributed largely to Anarchists. Contemporary concerns, such as immigration and the degeneration of British industrial cities, intermingled with the British people’s fear of Anarchists until many of England’s problems became understood in terms how they propagated Anarchists and how they influenced England’s susceptibility to Anarchist attacks.

The extensive media coverage of Anarchist assassinations during the Gap Years perpetuated the ideas of disease and abnormality spawned by the discussions of Anarchists after the Greenwich Outrage. By 1908, the British public was certain that Anarchists were depraved and amoral individuals, mentally predisposed toward violence and criminality. Anarchist assassins were often immigrants to the countries in which they assassinated, and the international community was galvanized by this knowledge to form collaborative efforts to track and police Anarchists. The International Anti-Anarchist Conferences of 1898 and 1904 aimed to increase cooperation between European nations and to limit the movement of Anarchists between countries. Though little productive legislation and enforcement resulted from these conferences, the International Anti-Anarchist Conferences heightened an already budding public perception that Anarchists threatened the security of the State and necessitated Government intervention.
New and in depth statistical reports detailing the problems of large, urban centers were also coming to the forefront of the British media around 1900. These reports described in vivid detail deplorable living conditions and high rates of crime and immoral behavior among the poor, often immigrant, neighborhoods in Britain’s industrial cities. These reports fueled pre-existing anxieties about the large numbers of immigrants entering England, and by 1908 the British public attributed many of the problems associated with urban slums to immigrants. Britons increasingly feared that immigrants were stealing British jobs and degrading their cities with poor morals and vices, causing England to become more similar to foreign lands and less the glorious England of their imaginings.

The tens of thousands of Russian immigrants fleeing the violence of the First Russian Revolution further perpetuated the British people’s fear of immigrants. The stories of terror and bloodshed in Russia convinced English audiences that the Russian revolutionaries were especially fierce and terrible criminals. As the British press unanimously labeled the Russian revolutionaries as Anarchists, English media became rife with sensationalist press reports detailing extraordinarily fierce and animalistic actions carried out by supposed Russian Anarchists. Therefore, as 1908 turned to 1909, British citizens were becoming ever more fearful of immigrants and were beginning to identify all immigrants, regardless of their nationality or political affiliation, as Russian Anarchists. Fear that the immigrants flooding into England were not merely poor, helpless individuals in search of a better life but were rather desperate and depraved Anarchists deepened the pre-existing resentment that many Britons had regarding immigrants. As press exposés and serials continued to barrage the public with stories of Anarchists, typically Russians, travelling easily to and from England and using London as a hub to plan their Anarchist activities, the British public became increasingly concerned over
England’s lax immigration laws and began to view immigrants as not only a threat to their jobs and their neighborhoods but also as a threat to the State.

In this hotbed of media writings on Anarchists, immigrants, and the other violent, radical groups that were emerging at the time, the British public conceptualized a new idea of individualism. They no longer idolized the notion of individual liberty that had prevailed during the Victorian Era. They no longer believed that individuals would only advance their own gain so long as their gain did not harm others. At the turn of the twentieth century the British public began to identify a new class of individuals, extreme individuals, and this class of extreme individuals did not care who they harmed as they endeavored to make their place in the world. Extreme individuals were selfish and vain people without any political legitimacy or virtue. Extreme individuals thrived on chaos and destruction and were willing to do anything to acquire fame and notoriety. Anarchists became the most frequently cited example of extreme individuals, although Nihilists, Socialists, Suffragettes, Irish, and Boers were also labeled and denounced as such.

While the origins of extreme individuals remained unknown, either innate disease or mental abnormality, environment or governmental regime, extreme individuals had a marked effect on the British public’s consciousness. Extreme individuals united the British people into a singular front. The nation developed an ‘us versus them’ mentality that lumped extreme individuals, such as Anarchists, Socialists, and Suffragettes, into one group and the rest of civilized society into another group. The united group could be England, London or The West; it could be rich, or it could be poor. The one thing it could not be, however, was selfish, vain or disinterested in the greater good of the nation. A war-like mentality began to emerge in England, and the British people began to view themselves as actors in a war against Anarchists. The
British public began to fear that Anarchists could destroy the security of the nation, either through Anarchist bombings and assassinations or through the scourge of immigration. Many Britons called upon the State to protect them from the Anarchist menace, and although the State did little to do so, some English citizens began to suggest that individual liberties should be restricted to better protect the nation from extreme individuals, such as Anarchists.

B. THE TOTTENHAM OUTRAGE, 1909 – A NATION UNPREPARED FOR THE PERCEIVED “REALITIES” OF ANARCHISTS IN ENGLAND

“An amazing Anarchist outrage, which took place in North London on Saturday, has resulted in the discovery that Tottenham is the centre of a colony of Russian Anarchists.”


The myriad of fears ruminating in the minds of Britons by the end of 1908 came to glaring fruition with the scandal of the Tottenham Outrage on 23 January 1909. The Tottenham Outrage, a set of barbaric and ruthless crimes that occurred in the East End, supposedly perpetrated by Russian Anarchists, validated to the British public the anxieties that had been building since the Greenwich Outrage. The emergence of Anarchist violence on British soil for the first time in nearly fifteen years confirmed the public’s worst fears – Anarchists were present in England, and England’s liberal freedoms did not grant the nation a pardon from Anarchist violence.

The Tottenham Outrage and the massive media frenzy that occurred in the weeks following returned Anarchism to the forefront of the British public’s discourse on England’s problems. Many articles claimed that the robbery was an effort to fund Anarchist attacks abroad, and the British public became increasingly committed to the theory that Anarchists were utilizing
England as a central base from which to plan their attacks. The conclusion that the criminals were Russian Anarchists firmly linked Anarchism to immigrants and convinced many citizens that immigration was little more than the importation of Anarchists. The seemingly unnatural violence and temerity of the criminals also confirmed English fears that Russian immigrants were unusually powerful and dangerous. Additionally, the Tottenham Outrage reinforced the public’s concern that British police were ill-prepared to handle the excessive violence and uncanny acumen of Anarchists. In the end, the Tottenham Outrage segued into a national outcry for reform, both of the police, who were viewed as too inept or under-resourced to manage the Anarchist threat, and of immigration, which was viewed as an open invitation for Anarchists to flock to England.

i. KEY EVENTS IN THE TOTTENHAM OUTRAGE

On 23 January 1909 two men, armed with heavy revolvers, waited outside the gates of a rubber factory in Tottenham for the cashier to return from the bank with the factory’s payroll. As the car halted at the gate the waiting men fired shots at the driver and the cashier, snatched the bag of money and fled, firing at their pursuers. Several witnesses gave chase, many with firearms, and a female onlooker even threw potatoes at the fleeing men. The cashier, numerous employees and several bystanders quickly overtook the two robbers in the factory’s motor-car, but the criminals did not surrender. Instead, they turned and ran directly toward their pursuers, repeatedly firing their weapons at them. One observer noted, “[The robbers] coolness seems to have been remarkable, for one man loaded while the second fired.”
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The motor-car was disabled by a bullet, and the pursuers continued the chase on foot, exchanging unabated gunfire with the robbers. The pursuit traveled into the Tottenham marshes where a policeman managed to grasp one of the men, but the robber killed the policeman by shooting him through the neck and again through the temple. The robbers also killed a young boy in the marshes by deliberately shooting the boy in the head as they passed him during their flight. The robbers attempted to shoot a woman at point blank range as well, although the gun misfired. Additional policemen, armed with firearms, joined the already large crowd of police and bystanders who were pursuing the fugitives, and when the chase passed several sportsmen on horseback who were hunting birds, the police shouted for the sportsmen to join the pursuit and fire upon the robbers.

Upon reaching a road, the criminals hijacked a public tramcar and forced the operator at gunpoint to flee from the police. The police seized a civilian’s horse-drawn cart and overtook the tramcar, but one of the robbers shot the horse. A second tramcar was commandeered by the pursuing mob, and the robbers fired their revolvers repeatedly at the tramcar pursuing them and at the crowd of onlookers standing on the roadside. Additional vehicles were seized by the pursuers, which comprised a mob of at least seventy men, and the robbers’ tramcar was eventually cornered. Still unrelenting, the two robbers stole a nearby milk cart and fled again, brutally whipping the horse and firing at passing pedestrians as well as firing at the encroaching mob.

Ultimately, the robbers abandoned the cart and ran on foot across a field, where they scaled a six foot fence. One robber was shot several times while climbing the fence, and before he could be captured he committed suicide. The other man cleared the fence and fled toward a bevy of houses where he shot a workman and entered a house. The remaining pursuers, which
were now a mob of fifty to sixty men, comprised only of the police utilizing bicycles and motor-cars and the mounted sportsmen, surrounded the lone criminal in the house. Armed with “rifles, shotguns, revolvers, and even blunderbusses,” the mob trapped the second robber in the house, and he, too, committed suicide.  

In the wake of these events, dramatic reports swept through the British media. *News of the World* riddled its papers with sensationalist headlines, such “Trail of Blood Over North London,” “Thoroughfares Swept with Bullets,” and “Blood flowed like water yesterday in Tottenham.” Stories of the Anarchist crimes committed in Tottenham that day captivated the English public, and when the funeral of the slain officer and the murdered boy occurred on 29 January, Britons flocked to the ceremony in a grand fashion. More than 3,000 police marched in the funeral procession, with each division of London’s police forces sending at least eighty men. Mounted police, a firing squad, three police bands, inspectors from various divisions, and several high officials, including the Under Secretary for Home Affairs and the Commissioner of the London Police, joined the funeral march as well. A detachment of Scots Guards and a detachment Royal Guard Artillery also marched in the procession, as did the Tottenham Fire Brigade with its engine, the Tottenham Urban District Council, and a detachment of Postmen. Tramway employees, honoring the absconded tramcar, and a large contingent of the Hackney and Westham Unemployed organizations showed their support of the slain by rounding out the procession. 

The funeral convoy was an impressive event, conducted with exceptional pomp and circumstance. The hearses carrying the two coffins were elaborately decorated with ornate

---

321 Ibid.  
323 Ibid.  
accoutrements, and the horses were adorned with lavish headdresses. Hundreds of flowers and letters from citizens across England festooned the coffins, and the slain officer’s coffin bore the British flag, which was typically reserved for military funerals. The high officials, police, and civil organizations in attendance marched in rank, wearing their official livery. Informal associations, such as the Hackney and Westham Unemployed organizations, carried banners supporting the fallen, and more than 500,000 British citizens lined the streets along the route, climbing onto roofs and peering through windows to glimpse the tribute. Shops along the procession route voluntarily closed for the day, darkening their windows with blinds and black sheets in honor of the deceased, and every flag in London was drawn to half-mast. So many people attended the funeral that most shops around London were closed, and many services, such as mail and public transportation, were suspended for the day because the employees were marching in the funeral.  

The funeral for those slain in the Tottenham Outrage illustrated the concern felt by the British public. News of the World described the funeral the following day, stating, “Sympathy with the fate of the gallant constable who met so untimely an end in doing his duty to the public was demonstrated on an almost unparalleled scale on Friday. The body of P.C. Tyler was carried to the grave amidst manifestations of sorrow from the military and civil authorities, while the public assembled in enormous crowds to testify their regret for the loss of a brave man’s life and their admiration for his conduct.” Every segment of the population answered calls to raise money for the widow of the fallen officer, amassing more than one thousand pounds in just two weeks.


weeks, and eventually the papers had to print requests for Britons to stop sending money. Even the Prime Minister, Herbert Gladstone, sent one hundred pounds.\textsuperscript{327}

Despite the overwhelming outpouring of support demonstrated by the British public there was no official State-organized effort to attend the funeral or honor the fallen. Local bodies of Government and civil services voluntarily suspended services and marched in the procession. Even far from the funeral route, London shops closed early that day as there were few to no patrons to serve. Approximately, one out of every twelve people in London attended the funeral of the Tottenham Outrage victims, and those citizens who did not witness the elaborate pageantry first hand, most certainly experienced it through the press as British newspapers covered the affair in exhaustive detail.\textsuperscript{328}

ii. FEARS THAT EVOLVED DURING THE GAP YEARS ARE CONFIRMED IN THE PUBLIC MIND

a. THE BRITISH PUBLIC PERCEIVES THAT ENGLAND IS THE CENTER OF ANARCHISM IN EUROPE

The Tottenham Outrage returned Anarchist violence to England and reinforced many of the fears that had been growing in the minds of Britons. Reports that Russian rebels in the First Russian Revolution employed robbery and kidnapping to fund their causes propelled the British public into believing that the Tottenham robbery was an attempt to fund larger Anarchist efforts. On 25 January 1909 \textit{The Globe} reported that the robbery was “a means of obtaining money in
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furtherance of nefarious designs...” The following day, The Graphic printed an article titled, “APOSTLES OF EXPROPRIATION,” that discussed the fondness Anarchists had for using expropriation to fund their movement while expropriation was merely a polite word for burglary. The article likened the Tottenham Outrage to the many examples of expropriation that had occurred during the First Russian Revolution: “Saturday’s murders bore a strong resemblance to the crimes taking place daily in various towns in Russia.” Reports of crimes to fund Anarchism in Russia multiplied in British presses, such as the story of a St. Petersburg businessman who had received a letter demanding 10,000 roubles signed by “The Anarchists-Communists.” The Russian businessman did not pay the fee, and two weeks later his house was bombed. Additional articles corroborated claims that the Tottenham robbery was an attempt to fund Anarchism, including a News of the World report on Anarchism in February 1909 which stated, “As to the money, it must not be forgotten that the proceeds of burglaries and highway robberies have always been welcomed as supplies for the anarchist war-chests.”

As the British public viewed the robbery as an attempt to fund the Anarchist movement, the Tottenham Outrage confirmed the public’s pre-existing fear that Anarchists were utilizing England as a base to plan their attacks. The Daily Mirror wrote that England was overrun by dangerous Anarchists, reporting, “An amazing Anarchist outrage, which took place in North London on Saturday, has resulted in the discovery that Tottenham is the centre of a colony of Russian Anarchists.” The same day The Globe published a report with the headline “OUTRAGE MADE EASY,” explaining that Anarchists gathered in England because England was the only place that Anarchists could find refuge: “...alone among European countries the
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United Kingdom should offer comparatively safe quarters in which these crimes against humanity are conceived and organized.”\(^{334}\) The Daily Mirror concurred with these statements, claiming, “[The robbers] belong to the class of foreign criminals who, expelled from their own country, can find no refuge in any place on earth but England.”\(^{335}\) Even the police supported claims that England was an Anarchist base; detectives from Special Branch reported that the Tottenham criminals were leaders among a group of revolutionaries on the Continent, operating out of Riga, and regularly communicated with the heads of the Anarchist movement across Europe.\(^{336}\) Thus, after the Tottenham Outrage, the British public became certain that England was a crucial planning hub for scheming Anarchists to plot their violent acts.

b. THE STEREOTYPE OF THE RUSSIAN ANARCHIST IS SOLIDIFIED

Even without any substantial evidence, accusations that the two criminals were Russian Anarchists abounded. The day after the crimes Reynolds’s Newspaper announced, “The men have not yet been identified, but the dead robber is believed to be a Russian Jew,”\(^{337}\) and Lloyd’s Weekly claimed, “The assailants were last night identified…as Russian Anarchists.” According to Lloyd’s Weekly, these men were from the “alien colony” in Tottenham and “played a very prominent part in the Russian revolutionary movement.”\(^{338}\) The Daily Mail also claimed that the robbers were Russian Anarchists: “Facts in possession of the police demonstrate that both of the ruffians were connected with Terrorist organizations in Russia.”\(^{339}\) Although the press credited
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the police with identifying the robbers, the police files credited the press with identification, and it remains unclear today whether the Tottenham criminals were actually Anarchists. However, the British public did not doubt the assertion that the Tottenham robbers were Anarchists, and the frenzy to blame the crimes on Russian Anarchists clearly demonstrated how entrenched and readily accessible the image of Russian Anarchism was at the turn of the century.

The conclusion that the Tottenham robbers were Russian Anarchists fueled public concerns about the danger of Russian immigrants and enforced the idea that Anarchists were dangerous, diseased, and abnormal people. Stereotypes of Russian Anarchists as especially evil and powerful Anarchists were emboldened by the violent nature of the crimes and the difficulty the police had apprehending the suspects. The evil nature of Russian Anarchists was reinforced by the robbers’ seemingly wanton desire to kill while fleeing the factory. These criminals did not shoot only at the men pursuing them; they also shot intentionally and deliberately at innocent civilians, including women and children. The British media was outraged by the depravity of the criminals and decried the inhumanity of the robbers’ actions: “Who are these fiends in human shape who do not hesitate to turn their weapons on innocent little boys and harmless women?...The Answer is: They are foreign Anarchists, men who have been expelled from Russia....”

In addition to the police officer and the young boy killed by the Tottenham robbers, more than twenty individuals sustained serious gunshot wounds, and dozens of other pursuers and bystanders were less seriously injured. In all, more than four hundred bullets were fired at British citizens that day – at citizens who were either going peacefully about their business or were aiding their fellow countrymen in apprehending extreme individuals.

According to *The Globe*, “…alien thieves of desperate character created a scene of
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terror…without parallel in this country,” and it was only due to “God’s Mercy that they did not succeed in dealing out death on an even more wholesale scale.”343

The magnitude of the chase and the difficulty the police had apprehending the robbers also intensified the British public’s perception that Russian Anarchists were physically and mentally superior people. Not only did the pursuit last for more than two hours and cover more than five miles, but the Russian Anarchists were able to endure almost the entire ordeal on foot while the only Englishmen who were able to follow them to the bitter end were those carried by bicycles, cars, or horses. This suggested to the British people that Russian Anarchists were physically more powerful than the English. Press reports supported this opinion and highlighted the impressive physical stature and virility of the two criminals. The Globe described Hefeld, one of the robbers, as: “… a big fellow, of a magnificent physique, and very heavily developed.”344 The Daily Mail reported similarly on the second robber, Jacob, claiming, “He is a strongly built man, with a cadaverous face; a powerful jaw, and a perfect set of well-kept teeth.”345 According to the Daily Mail article, it was not poor shooting by the police that failed to halt the robbers but was instead the criminals’ remarkable physical endurance that sustained the chase: “When the shirts were taken off Jacob and Hefeld at the mortuary and hospital showers of small shot fell from them.”346 In addition, the Anarchists did not appear to fear their pursuers, showing little regard for their own safety. The fact that the criminals turned and charged the armed mob when cornered convinced the British people that Anarchists had no concern for their own lives and were willing to do anything, even at their own demise, to beget their cause. The Daily Mail claimed that the forces of law and order were not enough against
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such a threat “when the offenders are Anarchist aliens who hold their own lives as cheap as those of their victims.”

The mental acumen of the robbers also vexed the British people. The criminals eluded the police for hours, despite being seemingly trapped on numerous occasions, and much to the police’s chagrin, the money stolen by the robbers was never discovered. The British press reported that the money had been handed off to accomplices along the route, and although the robbers themselves died, the Anarchist plot to rob the factory and fund the Anarchist cause was deemed successful. An inside source for *The Star* described the robber named Jacob as a “very clever man” and asserted that he belonged to an Anarchist society filled with similarly clever Latvians. Other articles also supported the idea of enigmatic and shrewd Anarchist masterminds, such as one in *The Penny Illustrated Paper and Illustrated Times*, claiming, “In Tottenham there is a well-organised band of Anarchists, long known to the police, with a mysterious leader who always has ample funds.” The careful planning of the robbery and the subsequent loss of the money supported the stereotype of the cunning, plotting Russian mastermind, and the physical strength and the brazenness of the criminals emboldened the stereotype of Russian Anarchists as fierce and powerful adversaries. Thus, the ruthlessness of the robbers, combined with their physical strength, their mental prowess and their brash disregard for human life, confirmed and intensified the British public’s fear of Russian Anarchists.
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347 Ibid.
350 *The Penny Illustrated Paper and Illustrated Times*, 6 February 1909.
c. THE BRITISH PUBLIC BELIEVES THAT THE ANARCHIST THREAT NECESSITATES GREATER STATE INVOLVEMENT

Following the Tottenham Outrage, British citizens reproached the Government for its reluctance to address the dangers of Anarchism. They demanded that the State become more involved in policing Anarchists and ensuring the safety of the British nation. Critics also condemned the lack of restrictions against extreme individuals, such as Anarchists, and the lack of enforcement for the few restrictions that did exist. Immediately following the Tottenham crimes, Anderson spoke out against the Government’s attitude toward Anarchists in an editorial to *The Times*: “I have long felt that the apathy of our Government toward the Anarchist movement has not been worthy of us as a nation.” He believed that legislation to suppress Anarchists should be the first order of business in the next Parliamentary session and that to suppress Anarchists Parliament should adopt the harsh police legislation that existed in Ireland, such as the Coercion Act. He claimed,

> Every criminal statute is a ‘Coercion Act,’ and it is only by ‘coercion’ that crime of any kind can be suppressed. Or if the test of a Coercion Act be that it applies only to some particular part of the kingdom, the Metropolitan Police Code is one of the most notable examples of coercion in modern times. Without the Police Acts neither property nor life would be safe in London.\(^{351}\)

Other citizens agreed that the British State needed to become more involved to adequately guard the nation against Anarchists. A letter to the editor of *The Globe* asserted that the English Government was too lenient: “The recent events in and around London - the Tottenham and Shaftesbury-Avenue outrages - have brought home to us very forcibly the necessity of the

\(^{351}\) *The Times*, 25 January 1909.
enforcement of the Aliens Act... As a result of this we now find foreign Anarchists plundering and running amok in our very midst...”

A striking aspect of the Tottenham Outrage was the large number of civilians who pursued the two robbers in the chase from the rubber factory. While many of the pursuers were police officers, several dozen civilians also joined the hunt to apprehend the criminals. Not only was the chase a long and grueling ordeal, but it was also extremely dangerous as the robbers were armed and fired repeatedly at the trailing mob. In fact, several of the civilian pursuers were among those injured by the Tottenham criminals. The overwhelming public involvement in apprehending the robbers illustrated the ‘us versus them’ mentality that pervaded the English middle- and working-classes by 1909. The British middle- and working-classes believed that Anarchism was a grave peril and that tremendous effort and sacrifice was warranted to combat such a powerful threat. Therefore, people were willing to endanger their lives and their property to defend London against the Anarchist menace. The British people believed that it was their civic responsibility to protect their neighborhoods from Anarchism. In fact, prominent Government officials had explicitly placed the burden of protecting the nation from Anarchists upon everyday citizens.

The British public’s willingness to defend their communities, however, did not absolve the State from its role in protecting the nation. Dozens of British citizens were injured in the chase, and hundreds of pounds of private property were also damaged. Individuals who sustained injury to themselves or their property demanded retribution from the State. They believed that the State had been derelict in its duty to protect England from Anarchists and that the civilian pursuers had been fulfilling the State’s obligation to protect the nation. Therefore,
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those injured in the debacle felt entitled to State compensation for their losses. In a February 1909 speech Prime Minister Gladstone addressed the civilian victims, those who had lost property or were wounded in the Tottenham crimes. In his speech, Gladstone “referred to the terrorist murderers, and after paying a warm tribute to the conspicuous gallantry of the police and public who pursued the assailants, he said the government would take steps to see that some compensation was given to those people who had suffered in the public cause.” According to the press, the crowd assembled followed his statements with loud and vigorous cheering.354

1. THE PUBLIC CALLS FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM

Immigrants had been linked to Anarchism in England since the Walsall Outrage, and during the Gap Years, 1895-1908, the British public had speculated extensively on the notion that all immigrants, especially Russian immigrants, were Anarchists, or at least potential Anarchists. The Tottenham Outrage supported the public’s pre-existing fear that immigrants were Anarchists. In February 1909 The Penny Illustrated Paper and Illustrated Times published an exploratory article on the link between immigrants and Anarchists titled “ALIENS ISLAND: COLONIES WHICH ARE A MENACE TO CIVILISATION.” The article concluded that many immigrants were Anarchists and that “islands” of immigrant Anarchists were erupting across London. The article also claimed that these immigrants were the most brutal and deviant sort and were experts at all criminal enterprises:

A portion of Tottenham is nick-named Aliens Island, and it teems with dangerous foreign criminals of every description. There are hundreds, more of them in Soho, and in Clerkenwell, whilst another section contrives to conceal itself in the quiet suburb of Peckham...These men have facilities for securing arms and
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carrying on their brutal doctrines which they can obtain in no other country; as soon as they get into trouble in the land of their birth they fly to England…Nearly all of the big Anarchist outrages of the last few years have been hatched within a four mile radius of Charing Cross.\footnote{The Penny Illustrated Paper and Illustrated Times, 6 February 1909.}

British citizens viewed immigrants from countries with strict, autocratic governments as particularly dangerous. Immigrants from countries such as Russia, Italy, and France were perceived as exceedingly prone toward Anarchism. A letter to the editor of The Guardian asserted that the tyrannical government of the Russian tsars and their unjust practices, such as pogroms, torture, assassinations, and executions without trial, had produced extraordinarily ruthless and hardened Anarchist criminals.\footnote{The Guardian, 27 January 1909.} The Weekly Dispatch agreed that Russia’s oppressive government was largely responsible for the Anarchists that were menacing England: “The system of government in Russia is known to breed Anarchists of a particularly ferocious type, and…fugitives of the Czar’s Government have found a safe refuge in England. But the Tottenham atrocity has roused the wrath of the whole nation, and the country looks to the Government to cut out the alien cancer in our midst.”\footnote{The Weekly Dispatch, 31 January 1909.}

The Tottenham Outrage confirmed the British public’s pre-existing fear of immigrants, and the stereotype that immigrants were often Anarchists became even more entrenched within British public consciousness. Immigrants from autocratic countries were especially feared for their Anarchist propensity, and the public called upon the Government to restrict such people from entering England.

While the British people demanded that the State protect the nation and control Anarchism in several different ways, immigration reform was the primary method advocated by the public. The British public perceived England’s current immigration laws as too lax to satisfactorily deter Anarchists and other extreme individuals. They alleged that the Aliens Act of
1905 was too weak and was too inadequately enforced to prevent detrimental immigrants from entering England. Many members of the British public charged the State with instating stricter entry criteria for immigrants. They wanted assurances that immigrants entering England were legitimate political refugees and not dangerous criminals. Two days after the Tottenham crimes *The Daily Mirror* posited that the current immigration laws were not strict enough and advocated greater cooperation between international police agencies: “Of course, the very worst types may get in by being well-dressed and of presentable appearance. The only way to keep them out is to establish closer relations between our police and those of other countries, so that due notice should be given to us of aliens coming to reside here...If a man has a character in his own country we don’t want him.”

*The Penny Illustrated Paper and Illustrated Times* concurred with these statements, asserting, “Something undoubtedly will have to be done immediately to stop the flow of alien criminals into this country.”

In addition to a wholesale strengthening of immigration laws to deter criminal immigrants, the British public believed that Anarchists specifically should be banned from England. They insisted that all Anarchists should be denied entry, regardless of their status as political refugees, and proposed that all existing Anarchists within Britain should be evicted. *The Daily Mail* listed a host of Anarchist crimes from the both the Continent and in England to illustrate the dangers of Anarchists. The article asserted, “The best method of preventing the repetition of such a crime is to exclude the Anarchist outlaw...”

An inquest from the victims of the Tottenham Outrage also rebuked the Government’s acceptance of Anarchist immigrants when the foreman of the Jury addressed the court, stating, “It is an inconceivable scandal that any Government should allow aliens of this type a footing in England, and we earnestly beseech
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the Government to take such steps as may remove from Great Britain the stigma of being the last refuge of these Continental criminal desperadoes.”

2. THE PUBLIC CALLS FOR POLICE REFORM

Many British citizens also clamored for police reform in the wake of the Tottenham Outrage. The difficulty the police had apprehending the Tottenham criminals fueled pre-existing concerns that English police were ill-equipped to handle Anarchists, and the police’s plea for civilians to assist them in detaining the Tottenham robbers only enhanced that perception further. Press reports often cited the State’s lax restrictions on individual rights as the reason for the police’s inability to control England’s Anarchists. In February 1909 The Penny Illustrated Paper and Illustrated Times published an exposé on police dealings with Anarchists and claimed that the Special Branch of Scotland Yard attempted to control Anarchists but was impaired by England’s slack laws. The article averred that the Tottenham suspects were well known to the police but that the police were unable to punish them: “They could buy as many revolvers or pistols and as many hundred rounds of ammunition as they wished. The police were powerless to stop them.” The police, too, argued that the extant system was not equipped to contain Anarchists. According to a detective, “...we used to be able to deal with these people. They kept themselves more or less in Soho and East-End parts of London, but in recent years they have begun to spread themselves into much more respectable neighborhoods, suburbs like Holloway, Islington, and Shepherd’s Bush - which have been made quickly accessible by means of the ‘tubes.’” The article further asserted that Anarchists were also much better armed than the
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English police: “Nor is [the Anarchist] content with ordinary weapons - he must have the best...British weapons are no use for revolutionary purposes. Long-range weapons must be employed; hence [Jacobs] and Hefeld’s guns were the finest.” ³⁶³ Other articles supported claims that the British police were not as well armed as Anarchists, including a *News of the World* report, maintaining that Anarchists were “armed with up-to-date death-dealing pistols” that fired more bullets than English police pistols,³⁶⁴ and a *Lloyd’s Weekly News* article flaunted the auspicious headline “MURDERER’S FOREIGN REVOLVER.”³⁶⁵

3. THE BRITISH PUBLIC PERCEIVES THE FIGHT AGAINST ANARCHISTS AS A WAR

The difficulty British police had regulating Anarchism nurtured festering fears over turn of the century nationalist rivalries. Beginning in the 1860’s, the balance of power in Europe began to shift, and countries that had previously been minor international players, such as Germany, Italy, and the United States, gained prominence. Meanwhile, countries that had been major world influences, such as England and the Austro-Hungarian Empire, were downsizing their empires, and at home, the British public often perceived that England was declining in its authority abroad. Britons fretted over these new developments, and many British citizens worried that the might of the British Empire was in doubt.

Skeptics argued that England’s inability to subdue Anarchism reflected the State’s inadequate readiness for a major European war. These skeptics claimed that England was not as well armed as Anarchists and used evidence propagated by articles asserting this claim to bolster
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their argument that the British nation was less prepared for war than were the Continental nations. Many sources asserted that British weapons were no longer modern or state of the art, and these claims inflamed insecurities that England was no longer as strong as it had once been. On 29 January 1909 the *Daily Mail* insisted that the police’s inability to curtail Anarchism reflected an overall ineptitude of the British State at fighting foreign battles. The article averred that English police were much less successful combating Anarchists than their Continental counterparts, and if Continental police were so much fiercer than English police than so, too, perhaps were Continental soldiers fiercer than English soldiers. The article mentioned an English play titled “The Englishman’s Home” that had debuted in early 1909. The play highlighted England’s inability to roust an invasion and warned the public of the State’s ill-preparedness for a war on home soil. Originally, the play was heavily criticized for being unpatriotic; however, after the Tottenham Outrage the play was revisited and was appreciated as a warning to the nation. The *Daily Mail* claimed, “[The play] has given us a powerful and ghastly representation of the fate that waits on a people who ignore the lessons of war…and put their faith in the policeman and in that shibboleth that the Englishman’s home is his castle which none dare invade.” *The Weekly Dispatch* interviewed a seventeen-year veteran of the British army regarding the play and asked the soldier whether the “Battle of Tottenham” and the play “An Englishman’s Home” had taught Englanders a necessary lesson. The soldier answered, saying, “…you can bet all you own, or will ever have left to you, that each one of ‘em’s going
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368 “An Englishmen’s Home” by Frank Curson at Wyndham’s Theatre. “An Englishman’s Home” was set in London, and in the play, England suffered under foreign invasion. The story focused on the microcosm of a simple, middle-class family home that was besieged by invading soldiers. Lacking any significant defense from the British State, the family was forced to defend itself with barricades. The play culminated when the father shot an enemy officer, and the father was executed as punishment. The play stressed Britain's weakened stature in the world and its lack of civil and military preparation against foreign threats.
home without learning the lesson – that one day their own houses may be barricaded with pianos and sofas and mattresses while foreigners are potting the Territorials behind those articles with rifle and artillery fire.”

Following the Tottenham Outrage the English public increasingly viewed the fight against Anarchism as a war. It was unlike any other war that England had waged, but the public perceived Anarchism as a war, nonetheless. Anarchists were foreign invaders who were attacking and murdering British citizens on British soil through horrific and violent acts. The elaborate funeral for the deceased victims of the Tottenham Outrage and the extensive media attention that the funeral generated further perpetuated the belief that the Tottenham Outrage was comparable to an act of war and was a matter for the entire nation. Lloyd’s Weekly News described the funeral, stating, “London has witnessed few more memorable spectacles than that presented on Friday at the funerals of Police-constable Tyler and Ralph Joscelyne, the victims of the Tottenham affray.” News of the World reported, “Sympathy with the fate of the gallant constable who met so untimely an end in doing his duty to the public was demonstrated on an almost unparalleled scale on Friday. The body of P.C. Tyler was carried to the grave amidst manifestations of sorrow from the military and civil authorities, while the public assembled in enormous crowds to testify their regret for the loss of a brave man’s life and their admiration for his conduct.”

The use of the Union Jack, the British National Flag, on the coffin of the fallen police officer likened the officer’s actions to those of a soldier in a war. The Union Jack had traditionally adorned the coffins of military soldiers prior to the funeral of Police Constable Tyler, and it symbolized to the British public that the officer who had died apprehending
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Anarchists that day had died as a soldier who was defending his country in the war against Anarchism. The use of the firing squad, also typically reserved for military funerals, and the large number of government officials and civil services that marched in the funeral procession further intensified the public perception that combating Anarchists was akin to waging a war. The 500,000 people who followed the funeral march along its two and half mile route from the constable’s house to the cemetery and the hundreds of hawkers who wandered the streets selling mourning-cards that commemorated the deceased also contributed to the impression that the nation was at war. Such grand spectacles were typically reserved for national heroes and individuals who had somehow enhanced the safety or well-being of the nation.

Many press articles also invoked the language and images of war to describe England’s fight against Anarchists. Lloyd’s Weekly News described to its readers the cottage where the second Tottenham criminal was finally trapped: “It is a quaint picturesque little building, standing beside a miniature village green, now trampled by the little besieging army of police and civilians.” The Weekly Dispatch quoted the Tottenham Outrage Coroner, Dr. Ambrose, when he spoke to the Jury at the inquest for the victims of the Tottenham Outrage, saying, “On the day of the outrage, walking through Tottenham, one was exposed to as much danger as if a war was going on. This terrible state of affairs must be stopped.” Dr. Ambrose’s statement was followed by enthusiastic applause and cheering throughout the courtroom. Thus, by the end of the Tottenham Outrage the English public perceived the fight against Anarchists to be akin to a war that Britain was waging against a foreign entity.
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The depiction of the Anarchist menace as a war also intensified the British public’s building perception that the State should be more involved in regulating Anarchists. The British people perceived Anarchists as a threat to the State and not merely a civic matter to be overseen by local police. As Anarchists were deemed a threat to the State, the nation and the Empire, the public held the Government responsible for subduing the Anarchist danger. British presses published dozens of letters and articles that criticized the Government for their lack of involvement in the Anarchist problem and demanded that the State become harsher and more restrictive toward Anarchists. *The Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science, and Art,* printed a scathing criticism of the British Government, condemning the State’s stance toward Anarchists. The article asserted that Anarchists required strong action and repression but that the English Government would not dare repress their freedoms, thus, instead subjecting the English public to the dangers of Anarchists. According to the article,

…we happen to have a Government that would prefer to suppress the House of Lords and not anarchists; that has stultified the Aliens Act by instructions to pass all aliens who claim to be refugees…We have deserved the humiliating lesson of Tottenham. It is quite a fit and proper punishment for the encouragement and protection we have given to gentle victims of Russian tyranny that they should give us this taste of their quality.376

A similar article, titled, “THE ANARCHIST IN LONDON” declared Anarchists to be “enemies of society” and demanded that the State adopt more interventionist policies in combating Anarchists. The article also maintained that neither the British public nor any single nation alone could defeat Anarchists, averring that only international cooperation could defeat Anarchists: “In short, it is only by the combined efforts of the Governments of all countries that militant anarchism can be met and crushed…”377 *The Globe* also blamed the Government for England’s
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Anarchist menace, and the Coroner who examined the Tottenham criminals weighed in on the matter:

We can only hope that [Prime Minister] Mr. Herbert Gladstone will realise that the responsibility of preventing further outbreaks lies at his door...he would rather run the risk of having his own countrymen murdered than hurt the feelings of foreign refugees...the government must know...that a man who is a criminal in Russia will not suddenly become a model of all the virtues when he chooses to transplant his activities to freer soil.\(^{378}\)

Thus, by 1909, the British public insisted that the State was responsible for policing Anarchists, and many Britons were no longer satisfied with the liberal policies of the Victorian era and the sanctity of individual liberty, especially for immigrants and political refugees. In short, the English public was beginning to clamor for the Government to enact stricter and more interventionist legislation that could curtail the freedoms of Anarchists and protect the nation.

iii. THE TOTTENHAM OUTRAGE CONCLUSION

The robbery, police chase, murder of an officer and a child, and myriad of other injuries that occurred in Tottenham on 23 January 1909 and became known as the Tottenham Outrage were a public spectacle and discourse that firmly returned Anarchist violence to England. The fears that had vexed the British public during the Gap Years, 1895-1908, appeared to become realities in the wake of the Tottenham Outrage. The British people were convinced that the Tottenham robbery was an attempt to fund Anarchist efforts abroad, and the public concluded that England was the central base for Anarchist operations throughout Europe. They believed that England’s lax immigration laws and liberal individual freedoms allowed Anarchists to easily travel into England and plot attacks within the safety of England’s borders.

The finding that the Tottenham robbers were Russian and Latvian immigrants intensified the anxiety British citizens felt toward immigrants at the turn of the century and strengthened critics’ assertions that all immigrants were potential Anarchists. After the Tottenham Outrage the public increasingly equated immigrants with Anarchists, and the dangers the British people placed upon immigrants multiplied. Russian or Eastern European immigrants were perceived as particularly dangerous immigrants due to the pervasive notion that Russian immigrants were Anarchists and that Russian Anarchists were particularly dangerous. The exceptional endurance and violence of the Tottenham robbers affirmed the Russian Anarchist stereotypes that had originated between 1895 and 1908. The British public became convinced that Russian Anarchists were unusually fierce, violent, cunning, and powerful Anarchists that presented an unprecedented danger. The British public also worried that British police were not prepared to handle criminals as debased and evil as Russian Anarchists and began to appeal for police reform.

Appeals for immigration reform also resulted from the Tottenham Outrage as Englanders called upon their leaders to protect the country from Anarchist violence. Critics became concerned that the State was unable or unwilling to control the Anarchist menace. Many opponents wondered if the State’s inability to subdue Anarchists reflected deeper faults that would impair the State’s ability to protect England and its Empire in the event of a major European war. Overall, the Tottenham Outrage increased the British public’s perception that England was at a war with Anarchists and that England was ill-prepared to win that or any war. Therefore, the British public contended that the State needed to become more involved and adopt stricter immigration legislation and harsher police laws to protect the nation from Anarchists.
C. CONCLUSION – THE PERCEIVED DANGER OF ANARCHISTS ESCALATES AND LEADS TO SHIFTS IN BRITISH PUBLIC OPINION

Despite the lack of Anarchist activity in Britain between 1895 and 1908, the British people continued to speculate on the existence of Anarchists in England. They hypothesized that Anarchists were immigrating into England under the guise of political asylum, and many British citizens spoke out against the dangers of England's lax immigration laws. Numerous critics argued that England's lenient immigration laws had transformed England into an international Anarchist hub. They asserted that careless immigration laws allowed Anarchists to easily travel between countries and that England's liberal society allowed them to plot their attacks in safety. Large-scale statistical reports regarding the problems of the urban poor also emerged in 1901 and 1903 and contributed to the British public’s concern over immigration. These reports and the litany of media coverage they propagated inspired many citizens to attribute the degeneration of British working-class neighborhoods to the large proportion of immigrants living within these boroughs.

The violence and ferocity of the First Russian Revolution in 1905 were also heavily reported on by the British press, and press reports claimed that the violence in Russia was not the result of legitimate revolution but was instead the doings of unscrupulous Russian Anarchists. The British public began to worry that the thousands of Russian immigrants fleeing the violence in Russia and immigrating into England were actually virulent Anarchists rather than hapless victims. Such speculations heightened pre-existing British fears that immigration was importing Anarchists into the nation. Stereotypes of Russian Anarchists as exceptionally fierce, powerful
and debased individuals began to emerge, and these stereotypes fed into the pre-existing fear that immigrants, especially Anarchist immigrants, would degrade or destroy England.

The increased visibility of violent radical groups in Britain at turn of the century intermingled with the many anxieties vexing the British public from 1895-1908. The British public began to view people who participated in violent radical groups, such as Anarchists, Irish, and Suffragettes, as extreme individuals – individuals who possessed an unusual degree of selfishness, vanity, and want of fame. Extreme individuals, such as Anarchists, were willing to commit any atrocity to gain said notoriety and fame. They valued their own selfish interests over the greater good of the group and did not refrain from actions that would hurt others. The rise of extreme individuals engendered a new take on individualism in Britain. The Victorian era notion of individualism that praised individual freedom became old-fashioned and unsafe. Britons began to believe that liberal individual freedoms made England susceptible to the whims of extreme individuals, and segments of the English population began to call upon the State for stricter measures to repress the freedoms of extreme individuals, even if that required restricting the liberties of upstanding British citizens as well.

The events of the Tottenham Outrage in January 1909 gave substance to the numerous worries that the British public had been debating from 1895-1908. The crimes of two Russian Anarchists provided the English people with evidence upon which to base the fears that had been brewing during the prior thirteen years. The determination that the Tottenham criminals were Russian and Latvian immigrants and Anarchists who had recently emigrated from Russia solidified in the mind of the British public the belief that England was importing Anarchists into the nation through its overly accepting immigration policies. Critics from across the country and from all socioeconomic classes began to clamor for harsher restrictions on immigrants and
broad-scale immigration reform. The exceptional circumstances of the Tottenham crimes, the arduous police chase, the difficulty the police had apprehending the criminals, and the brutal violence of the crimes, reinforced the stereotype that Russian Anarchists were unusually powerful and dangerous criminals. The British media overflowed with reports, exposés, and fictional stories that described the nearly omniscient cunning and the overwhelming physical prowess of Russian Anarchists. The English presses also reported that the robbery which had instigated the Tottenham crime spree had been an attempt to fund the Anarchist movement on the Continent and that this array of crimes confirmed the previously alleged Anarchist base operating within Britain. As a result of the Tottenham Outrage, British citizens embraced the notion that an extensive network of Anarchists was secretly plotting from within England.

The revelation that England was being utilized as an Anarchist hub and the affirmation that England was importing dangerous Russian Anarchists into the nation as immigrants galvanized the British people into a desire for reform. The British public implored the State to institute immigration and police reform. Through reform, the public aimed to prevent the entrance of dangerous Anarchists into the nation and aimed to better control the Anarchists that were already present within the country. The Tottenham Outrage also fuelled a war-like mentality in the mind of the British public. An ‘us versus them’ mentality had been growing since the Greenwich Outrage as the public united in their disdain for Anarchists and extreme individuals, but it was the widespread outpouring of support by the British people and the many military symbols that appeared in the Tottenham Outrage, particularly at the funeral, that firmly instilled it within the British public. The Tottenham Outrage transformed the Anarchist menace in Britain from an intellectual debate to a hands-on war. As wars were perceived as a matter for the State and not local governments, the British people increasingly called upon the State to
intervene in the Anarchist problem. Demands for stricter, more interventionist legislation filled the British presses as the British public contemplated the dangers Anarchists posed to both the State and the Empire.
A NEW NATION UNDER ANARCHISM: THE HOUNDSDITCH AFFAIR & THE SIEGE OF SYDNEY STREET, 1910-1911

“It is everywhere recognised that a real evil exists, and that in the interests of the public welfare some effective provision must be made to guard against a grave menace to the security and order of society.”

_The Morning Post_, 9 January 1911.

In the nearly two years between the Tottenham Outrage in early 1909 and the Houndsditch Affair and the Siege of Sydney Street in December 1910 to January 1911, the British public continued to debate the myriad of fears that arose from the wildly publicized Tottenham Outrage. Anarchists remained a popular catch phrase in the British press, and authors often speculated of an emerging Anarchist disease within England. The British public continued to express concerns over immigration and the potential poisoning of English cities with vast numbers of low quality and possibly Anarchist immigrants, and the seemingly unmitigated increase in extreme individuals and radical groups, such as Anarchists and Suffragettes, remained a topic of heated conversation within the British media.

The Sydney Street Outrage began with a foiled jewelry store heist in Houndsditch, where several Metropolitan Police officers were shot, and ended with a six-hour siege in an apartment building on Sydney Street in Stepney. These events were dubbed by the press, the ‘Houndsditch Affair’ and the ‘Siege of Sydney Street,’ and they went on to become the subject of popular
myth, featuring in crime novels, such as Robert Baker’s *The Mystery of ‘Peter the Painter’* (1946), as well as popular films, including *The Siege of Sydney Street* (1960) starring Kieron Moore and Donald Sinden.\(^{379}\)

The Sydney Street Outrage became a public spectacle, as thousands of Londoners viewed key proceedings first-hand, and countless more Britons watched these events unfold in the press. During this time, the crimes became a public focal point that concentrated wider political concerns and social anxieties. The all-consuming fear of Anarchism became a way through which many of England’s problems came to be analyzed and understood. Issues of immigration and deteriorating social conditions, such as poverty and unemployment, transitioned from being issues that only affected a select group of Londoners to national crises that endangered the lives of all British citizens. As a result of this dramatic change in public opinion, the stage was set for the creation of England’s social welfare policies in the twentieth century and their numerous periods of immigration reform. Such fears of Anarchists, immigrants, and a deteriorating nation helped spawn a potent nationalism of ‘negative integration,’ wherein the British people defined themselves in opposition to the perceived threat of internal enemies. While this nationalism held the potential to exclude some segments of the population, in practice, it gave a range of ethnic groups, political parties, and social castes a mechanism by which to assert their inclusion in the nation at the expense of a rather ambiguous enemy.

The political debates generated by these shared anxieties led to a reconceptualization of the State and its relationship to the individual and the social body. The expectations the British

\(^{379}\) The popular memory of these events continues to exert strong reactions in England and especially in London. For example, in 2008 a fierce row started in both the streets of Whitechapel and in the London press over a plaque placed on two recently built tower hamlets in Whitechapel, named Peter House and Painter House. The plaque erected on each building reads, “This block was built in 2006 by Tower Hamlets Community Housing and named after Peter Piaktow, who was known as Peter the Painter, the anti-hero of the nearby Sidney Street Siege.” See Matthew Drake’s “Honoring an anarchist: Fury as Siege of Sidney Street killer gets tower block plaque” in *Daily Mail*, 26 September 2008. More recently, “Peter the Painter” was a featured character on the 2012 ITV series, *Titanic*, again reflecting the continued speculation on his identity and life after the Houndsditch murders.
public had for the State changed for many individuals as a result of the numerous debates regarding the development of Anarchism in England and the preventative measures needed to control it. As the British public came to believe that the current liberal Government was unable to protect them from the escalating Anarchist threat, the Sydney Street Outrage prompted calls for a reassessment of England’s liberal heritage and initiated the move toward a stricter and more interventionist form of Government that would be better able to protect England from the threat of Anarchism. Within this period of discursive frenzy, one can see the seeds of the postwar interventionist State spawned from collective anxieties that reshaped British notions of society, Government, and the individual.

A. KEY EVENTS IN THE HOUNDSDITCH AFFAIR AND THE SIEGE OF SYDNEY STREET, 1910-1911

The story that would soon become a perilous threat to the nation began on Friday evening, 16 December 1910, when the Metropolitan Police responded to a local tip-off in Houndsditch, one of London’s immigrant boroughs in the East End. The warning concerned loud and suspicious noises coming from an apartment adjacent to a jewelry shop. A lone officer went to inquire at the residence but was turned away by a man that he later described as having a foreign accent. A squad of two sergeants and three constables returned and demanded entry into the dwelling, and several armed assailants rushed out of the door firing revolvers at point-blank range. All of the criminals escaped, although one was wounded by a stray bullet, and the criminals left behind four officers dead, or dying, and one seriously wounded.380

---

The next morning coverage of the crime appeared in several of Britain’s national newspapers. However, in the immediate aftermath of the Houndsditch shootings, there was little information for the papers to report. Given the lack of detail and evidence, an editorial in *The Morning Chronicle* mused, “A curious air of mystery hangs over the whole affair, and it is doubtful whether even the wounded men themselves can give any clear account or theory of the outrage.” Early police reports indicated that assorted implements inside the apartment may have been intended for breaching the wall into the jeweler’s store and breaking open the safe inside. There were hardly any details to identify the suspects, and the first descriptions released to the press on 19 December illustrated the limited evidence available to the police: “three men and one woman, all in their twenties or thirties; the men all had dark moustaches, and at least one of the men had a foreign accent.” The police assembled a manhunt in the East End, and reports claimed that a special force of forty officers had been assigned to scour the streets and alleys of the East End.

The police and public, then, had few concrete details to go on, which left a tremendous amount of room for speculation in the popular press. The crimes excited public interest, but there was no background to explore, motive to discuss, or even a clear story to tell. The events, thus, began to serve as a sort of blank canvas on which newspapers could decry the dangers of modern British life. Existing anxieties characteristic of the time began to fill in the factual gaps, and from the very beginning, coverage of the Sydney Street Outrage reflected more about the concerns of the press regarding the state of the nation than about the details of the perpetrators and their crime.
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381 *The Morning Chronicle*, 17 December 1910.
382 Although many police records of the case have since been lost or destroyed, the remaining police reports on the case can be found in the files of the Metropolitan Police in the National Archives, MEPO 3-191 and MEPO 5-110.
384 *Daily Express*, 20 December 1910.
The affair in Houndsditch was quickly magnified into a national issue when, on 22 December, the three slain policemen were given a State funeral at St Paul’s Cathedral in London. The major newspapers gave extensive coverage to this unusual event. The Times of the following day reported,

> St Paul’s has often been the scene of the obsequies of national heroes, brave soldiers, and gallant sailors, who crowned their services to the Empire by dying for it on occasions marked out in history by the glory and romance of war. But never, until yesterday, had there been a memorial service in the National Cathedral for policemen who, in our streets and at our very doors, shield us in our daily rounds…

The use of St Paul’s Cathedral symbolized, in the eyes of many observers, that these crimes were not mere acts of violence directed towards individuals but rather an attack on the nation comparable to the threat of war. Many observers made the connection to warfare explicit. The Daily Telegraph, for instance, claimed, “Not very many Londoners are ever called upon to realize, far less to experience, the terrible test from which these three men had not flinched … The risks of war, except in the most unusual circumstances, cannot be named in the same breath.”

After the service the caskets were transported in a regal procession for eight miles to the City of London Cemetery at Manor Park, Ilford. News reports took particular note of the crowds
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385 *The Times*, 23 December 1910. Noted officials and organizations at the funeral included: Recorder of London Sir Forrest Fulton, the City Sheriffs, City Solicitor Sir Crawford, City Coroner Dr. Waldo, City Surveyor Sydney Perks, High Commissioner of the Commonwealth of Australia Sir George Reid, the Masters of the City Companies, the Mayors of the London Boroughs, Commissioner of the City Police Captain J.W. Nott-Bower, the Chief inspectors of Scotland Yard, representatives from the police in Hastings and Essex, the Great Eastern Railway Police, the London Salvage Corps, the London County Council, the City of London Yeomanry, the Port of London Authority, and the London Cabdriver’s Union. For detailed lists of the procession, see especially *The Morning Post* and *The Daily Telegraph* on 23 December 1910. While the funeral lacked the typical vote or motion in Parliament usually necessary for a State Funeral, both the public and Government officials referred to it as such. The ceremonial aspect was nearly identical to a State Funeral, including the processional order, the regalia, and the location of the funeral service. The occasion of a State Funeral was extremely unusual as such ceremonies in England were typically reserved for monarchs. The very few civilian State Funerals in England included Sir Issac Newton, Lord Horatio Nelson, and, more recently, Sir Winston Churchill.

that stood witness the entire way: “Balconies, as well as windows, along the line of the route were crowded with spectators, and at every cross road people stood up on vehicles to see the procession pass.” The audience witnessed a parade of corporate bodies march by in succession. Nearly 800 police marched by in file accompanied by two police bands, a detachment of the Scots Guards and the Royal Artillery, and high officials of local and national Government. A reporter from The Morning Post reflected on the scale: “It seemed as though all of London had turned out yesterday to get a glimpse of the imposing ceremonial with which the three City Policemen who lost their lives at the call of duty were to be laid to rest.” The very visible presence of the large crowds, crossing both class and ethnicity, together with representatives of the Anglican Church, royal authority, civic Government, and military power, led to the perception that the outrage applied to the nation rather than to individuals, the East End, or even London. An editorial in The Times of the following morning encapsulated the gravity inspired by the spectacle of the state funeral: “All these things go to show the depth of the impression made upon the public mind by this murderous outrage, which, coming after the similar affair at Tottenham, proves the existence in our midst of a social peril from which we have hitherto flattered ourselves upon being exempt.”

A few days after the funeral, on 28 December, police raided a residence at 44 Gold Street, Stepney, which was believed to be the home of one of the assailants. Inside they found a large quantity of chemicals used to create explosives, books detailing the construction of bombs, a pistol and ammunition, a collection of literature and pamphlets in Russian that were identified as “anarchist propaganda” and a stack of correspondence in Russian postmarked from various

---

387 The Morning Post, 23 December 1910.
388 See especially The Morning Post, 23 December 1910; and The Daily Telegraph, 23 December 1910.
389 The Morning Post, 23 December 1910.
390 The Times, 23 December 1910.
locales across England.\textsuperscript{391} The next morning \textit{The Times} reported: “The discovery by the police at Gold-street, Stepney … removes all doubts that the men who murdered the City Police of Houndsditch belong to a dangerous group of Anarchists.”\textsuperscript{392} \textit{The Morning Post} echoed this sentiment in their morning headline: “Anarchists in London: Discovery of a bomb factory.”\textsuperscript{393} Based largely on the presence of the correspondence in the apartment on Gold Street, \textit{The Times} declared, “…it is not too much to say that proof of the existence of a somewhat extensive organisation has been established.” \textit{The Times} further speculated that similar Anarchist groups lay hidden across Britain and were in regular contact with the criminals who perpetrated the Houndsditch Affair.\textsuperscript{394}

The \textit{Daily Express} cover story of 29 December insisted that the apartment on Gold Street was a “‘bomb factory’ and Anarchist centre of the gravest character” and connected it with a fugitive the paper dubbed “Gardstein.” The article was typical of the alarmist tone of the press and the increasingly grand and speculative conclusions being drawn from the Houndsditch Affair. The \textit{Daily Express} claimed that the discovery was a confirmation of police fears: “From the night of the murders … the police suspected that they were faced with a far-reaching conspiracy of much greater importance than an ordinary case of shop-breaking. Their suspicion became certainty on Tuesday night.” Going still further, the article contended that “Gardstein” was

\ldots known to have been one of the five heads of the Anarchist movement in Europe and in no way an ordinary burglar. He was practically the head of the movement in England, the other four leaders having their headquarters in St Petersburg, Berlin, Paris, and Vienna respectively … The burglary planned in Houndsditch

\textsuperscript{391} The Russian materials collected from the site took several weeks to translate, and turned out to be more mundane than early rumors supposed. See Metropolitan Police files, MEPO 5-110.
\textsuperscript{392} \textit{The Times}, 29 December 1910.
\textsuperscript{393} \textit{The Morning Post}, 29 December 1910.
\textsuperscript{394} \textit{The Times}, 29 December 1910.
was only one of a series which have taken place in the past nine months, the object of which has been to provide funds for Anarchist operations.  

The *Daily Express* left its readers with a warning that the motives of the criminals were far more dangerous than the public suspected: “No shadow of doubt now remains that the murder of three City policemen was the work of Russian Anarchists. Little by little evidence has been gathered, every scrap of which points in one direction: That the burglary plot was planned by Russian Anarchists, who wished to obtain money for carrying out plots still more dangerous to the public welfare.”  

The final and most dramatic turn in the Sydney Street Outrage was still to come, however. It began on 2 January 1911 when London police received information that two of the wanted men were hiding out in an apartment building at 100 Sydney Street in Stepney. Nearly two weeks of rampant press coverage and public debate over the Houndsditch criminals and the projection of broader social anxieties onto the wanted men clearly influenced the scale of the siege brought to bear upon the two suspects. Early the following morning police began to surround the apartment building in the East End, and deeming the suspects more dangerous than normal men, reinforcements were called in. British papers widely circulated that nearly 1500 men were brought in to join the siege: 250 uniformed police with shotguns and rifles, 250 plain-clothes police, a detachment of nearly 1000 Scot’s Guards and Horse Artillery sent from the Tower of London, and a maxim gun.  

The suggestions made at the time of the funeral that Britain was at war appeared ever more real as columns of soldiers marched through the streets of 
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395 *Daily Express*, 29 December 1910.
396 Ibid.
397 Most of the police that arrived on the scene lacked firearms as they were traditionally issued only truncheons. The police raided the local shops in the area that morning to find rifles and ammunition which were then passed off to officers, many of which had no formal firearms training. Many of the double-barreled sporting rifles prominently featured in pictures of the siege were purchased that morning at the Gracechurch-Street shop. See *Daily Express*, 4 January 1911.
London. The magazine *Punch* characteristically joked about the mobilization: “There is, we hear, considerable discontent among the Territorials because they were not called out and given a chance of sharing in the glory.”

News of the siege spread quickly, and most contemporary accounts claimed that tens of thousands of Londoners left their homes and their jobs to watch the siege unfold throughout the morning. Nearly half of the assembled police and military force were reportedly needed to hold the large crowds of spectators at bay. Among the multitude that gathered to watch were a number of prominent Government officials, most notably the Home Secretary, Winston Churchill, whose presence was widely discussed in the press. The siege lasted for nearly six hours, during which time the two men trapped inside exchanged shots with the assembled forces outside, and it ended when smoke began to billow out from the windows of the apartment. The fire brigades were ordered not to put out the fire, and the crowd watched as the building was consumed by flames, killing the assailants and obscuring any evidence of their true identity or purpose.

**B. THE NUMEROUS PRE-EXISTING ANXIETIES OF THE EDWARDIAN ERA BECOME REPRESENTED BY THE SINGULAR FEAR OF ANARCHISM**

The Houndsditch Affair and the Siege of Sydney Street solidified in the public’s mind the fears that had been growing since Anarchists first emerged onto the English stage nearly twenty years earlier in Walsall. While the Tottenham Outrage was pivotal in planting the foundations of Anarchism firmly on British soil and linking the numerous dangers of Anarchists to the perils of
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398 *Punch, or the London Charivari*, 11 January 1911. p. 31.
399 *Daily Mail*, 7 January 1911.
immigration, it was the Houndsditch Affair and the Siege of Sydney Street that transformed Anarchism from angry newspaper rhetoric to a full-scale national emergency. No longer was the British public willing to sit idly by and simply debate the dangers of Anarchism. After the Sydney Street Outrage, the British public was propelled into a deep-seated desire for action.

The prominent role of Government and military at the siege heightened the already existing perception that the crimes were a problem for the nation as a whole and not just for the police. In addition, the visibly excessive force brought to bear on the hideout in Stepney, where two men with pistols were able to repel an armed force of 1500 for almost six hours, reinforced the notion that Anarchists living surreptitiously within England posed a particularly dangerous and menacing threat. An editorial in *The Daily Telegraph* warned, “There is no longer a shadow of excuse for pretending not to know what Anarchism means…the dullest ears cannot remain deaf to the sound of volley-firing in the heart of London.”

Lastly, the widespread belief that the siege had been botched led observers to identify and criticize the responsible parties. In a letter to the editor in *The Morning Post*, one anonymous “observer” charged, “I have never read of anything more crude, imbecile, and ridiculous than the action of the police yesterday. To catch two men they turned out a thousand men, with Artillery, maxims, rifles, shotguns, &c., incurring no end of expense, and then they did not do it, for the men were found dead.”

Over a month later a writer in *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine* made a similar assessment of the State’s ineptitude: “And providence right well came to their assistance…if the two men had not set the house on fire, I believe that the police, Home Secretary, troops, and all would have been there still.”

In sum, what had begun as a violent episode in the East End on 16 December had
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400 *The Daily Telegraph*, 4 January 1911.
401 *The Morning Post*, 5 January 1911.
402 *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine*, February 1911. p. 265. There was no conclusive evidence as to who started the fire in the besieged building, but the official police opinion later blamed the fire on the fugitives.
turned into a national crisis by the beginning of January. The British public actively sought to curb the danger by rooting out Anarchists in society and reforming a Government that had allowed such extreme Anarchist individuals to exist in the first place.

Much of the dramatic shift in public opinion and eventually Government policy triggered by the British fear of Anarchists can be understood through the theories of Hannah Arendt’s seminal work, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (1951). In *The Origins of Totalitarianism* Arendt discussed the role of anti-Semitism in the formation of extremist political groups like the Nazi Party. First, she argued that anti-Semitism, in its modern form from the 1870’s forward, initially found a receptive audience because it contained legitimate historical associations. According to Arendt, the Jews had occupied positions of economic power in Europe’s recent past, and when a financial crisis emerged, they could embody the problem even though they were no longer responsible. Second, she argued that totalitarian politics “use and abuse their own ideological and political elements until the basis of factual reality, from which the ideologies originally derived their strength and their propaganda value…have all but disappeared.” While anti-Semitism’s stereotype of Jews may have had its roots in reality, the myth gradually evolved into a new form unrelated to the actuality of the original historical connection.

Arendt demonstrated the way in which a single stereotype – in her case the subversive Jew – could symbolize a wide range of problems; the Nazi party framed a panoply of social and political issues within the rubric of the Jewish question. Arendt states, “Twentieth-century political developments have driven the Jewish people into the storm center of events; the Jewish question and anti-Semitism…became the catalytic agent…for the rise of the Nazi movement and the establishment of the organizational structure of the Third Reich, in which every citizen had to

---

prove that he was not a Jew…” According to Arendt, ambiguity played a key role in anti-Semitism’s widespread application. The Germans could blame the Jews for their defeat in the First World War because the targeted Jewish ‘individuals’ were ambiguous; without identifying particular persons, the position of blame could not be refuted. Thus, Arendt demonstrated that stereotypes drawn from historical realities could combine with situations of crisis to produce an ideology where the stereotype, increasingly divorced from reality, could be used to analyze a wide variety of political and social problems and, in turn, justify shifts in policy.404

Arendt believed that a single event could become the expression of many issues, and much like anti-Semitism became a central source of unity for the rise of the Nazi party, the various fears that the British public possessed at the turn of the century became compressed into the one popular fear of Anarchism. The discussion of Anarchism became a framework in which the layperson could express and understand their anxieties regarding the problems faced by Britain and the State. In the same way that the anti-Semitic stereotype of the Jews may have had some basis in reality, so, too, the fear of Anarchism may have had its origin in fact. Anarchists at the turn of the century had been assassinating heads of state and bombing buildings throughout Europe. Undoubtedly, discovering Anarchist plots afoot in their own cities would cause a degree of trepidation in most citizens. However, it was the ambiguity of the Anarchist threat, and even the ambiguity of the Anarchists themselves, combined with the litany of complex social and political problems that could be linked to Anarchism, that enabled the Anarchist stereotype to embody such a wide range of national fears. Because of the exceedingly vague and ambiguous nature of Anarchism and because there were not generally Anarchists available to refute the claims and stereotypes that were placed upon them, there was little opportunity for the stereotypes to be disproved, regardless of how devoid of reality they may have been.

404 Ibid. pp. xv & xiv.
i. THE BRITISH PUBLIC PERCEIVES IMMIGRATION AS THE IMPORTATION OF ANARCHISTS

The national issue most embodied by the Anarchist menace was unquestionably the debate over immigration. The association between immigrants and Anarchists that existed after the Tottenham Outrage became inexorably linked after the Houndsditch Affair and the Siege of Sydney Street. The British public had little left to debate. All immigrants, but particularly poor immigrants and those from Eastern Europe, were unanimously labelled Anarchists. Many of the fears surrounding immigrants were based upon the notion that immigrants would breed Anarchism within England. Not only were the immigrants themselves deemed likely to be Anarchists, but the presence of immigrants within English cities was also believed to create conditions that fostered the growth and emergence of new Anarchist sympathizers within the nation. The British public additionally feared that the increasing numbers of immigrants arriving into British cities everyday would cause England to become irrevocably changed in such a way that England was no longer the England of their imaginings. The public feared that the growing neighborhoods of immigrants would expand into foreign colonies where the debased morality of Anarchism and other extreme individuals would run rampant. Between a foreign, and likely Anarchist, contamination of the English gene pool and the propensity of Anarchists toward civilization- and order-ending violence, the citizens of Britain became convinced that the massive influx of immigrants into England would become the downfall of the nation.

The press began connecting the crimes to the issue immigration as early as 19 December. A Daily Mail editorial highlighted the non-English status of the suspects, drawing a clear line
between civilized England and barbaric immigrants: “The recklessness with which the burglars used their revolvers shows them to be a gang of desperate criminals of the worst type. We are glad to think that they are not English. Their barbarous methods, like their speech, are alien to our ways.”405 The following day, 20 December, The Daily Chronicle further clarified the danger of immigrants by linking them to past Anarchist outrages: “They are Russians – probably Lithuanians. Men of the same race, it will be recalled, were responsible for the Tottenham outrage two years ago.”406 An anonymous official of the Metropolitan Court extended the threat of Anarchism to all immigrants: “They come into this country … [and] a few thousand aliens, more or less, are soon absorbed in London – prepared to do any desperate job for money. Murder is nothing to them; and burglary, rather than political machination, is their real aim. They are, of course, chiefly anarchists, and they follow respectable callings, if at all, only as a cover for their lawlessness.” The author concluded by suggesting that immigrant status alone was a useful guide for identifying Anarchists.407

The press quickly sought to draw a line between normal British citizens and the Houndsditch suspects, who were characterized as crazed, violent and uncivilized, closer to an animal or a reptile than a human. An article in The Daily Telegraph described one of the wanted men, still presumed to be on the loose: “The man called “Peter the Painter” turns out to be still at large. This fact is a greater public danger than if a full-grown Bengal tiger had escaped into the East-end from the zoo. The deadly and predatory human creature is in this case much the more savage and competent animal of the two.”408 The Daily Mirror described the Houndsditch
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405 Daily Mail, 19 December 1910.
407 The Times, 29 December 1910.
408 The Daily Telegraph, 6 January 1911.
criminals as “some demonical specimens of the genus Thug,” and over the next few months, the press commonly denounced individuals or groups because they were of the “Houndsditch type.”

Many commentators utilized the Sydney Street Outrage as evidence that all immigrants were of a naturally more dangerous character than the English. An article in The Morning Post stated,

One has only to mention the Tottenham case, where a policeman was murdered by aliens after a highway robbery, and the outrage of Friday night in Houndsditch, to demonstrate that while in dealing with ordinary British citizens the policeman has very little fear of being attacked by a man with a revolver, yet where the alien is concerned the danger of murder is great.

Many of the dangers in Britain were attributed to immigrants; at a meeting of the British Waiters, Cooks, and Carvers’ Society, Mr. A. Gray commented that ninety percent of crime in London was committed by foreigners. The Nineteenth Century and After made a similar claim: “…the criminal and vicious cases among the foreign population in this country were wholly out of proportion to the total number of aliens.” One reporter warned that the problem was steadily worsening: “Immigration has largely increased, the type of immigrant has deteriorated, and the aliens do not assimilate with the native population.” Following the Sydney Street Outrage, the British public’s conception of the nation came to exclude immigrants because they were deemed an inherent threat to British society: “In the past England had set a noble example to other European States by affording an asylum to all exiles, whether discrowned kings or humble
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citizens, who were in peril; but it would seem that the interest of self-preservation demanded that we should keep the alien out when his presence was undesirable.”

Speculation over the depraved character of the Houndsditch criminals and their alleged backgrounds as Russian immigrants intensified the widespread belief that inferior and criminally predisposed immigrants were contaminating the nation. Sir George Woodman, a member of the London Immigration Board asserted, “My opinion is that the public should be aroused to the danger of what is going on. It should be seriously considered whether it is any longer desirable that people physically and mentally inferior to our own race should be allowed to depreciate our physical qualities as a nation.” In a letter to the editor of The Morning Post, E.C.F. James wrote, “England is a small island with a very large and increasing population of its own. Why should it harbor the outcasts of Europe?” Many observers felt that the contamination of foreigners was quite literal; Sir William Evans Gordon stated, “Among the evils to be dealt with wherever such a population gathers is imported disease. A very large number of the aliens from Eastern Europe suffer from the form of ophthalmia known as trachoma, and favus, a disgusting disorder affecting the scalp, is very prevalent among them. Both these diseases are contagious and are spread by immigrants among the poorer class of English people.” Invoking “their criminal propensities and the pestilently [sic] evil influence they exercise,” he suggested that, “were it not for our belief in a future life, we should do well to exterminate them like plague-infected vermin.” Similarly, The Observer concluded,

Better that fifty thousand of the more squalidly blameless aliens admitted during the last few years had been excluded from our
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shores rather than that things like these should occur. If we allow active anarchism, with its whole creed of social violence, to enter this country under the plea that it is a political phenomenon, we might as logically permit the free importation of rabies and the cult of hydrophobia under the plea that some persons might regard it as a political complaint.\textsuperscript{420}

By 1911 the British public was well versed in the dangers posed by Anarchist immigrants acting as assassins or bombers. However, this was not the only method through which English citizens believed that immigration could destroy the nation. The British public also feared that immigrants, which automatically included Anarchists by 1911, would degrade the biological and moral purity of the English nation. They contended that diseased and debased Anarchist immigrants polluted the boroughs in which they settled and worsened the living conditions of decent, honorable British citizens. They believed that immigrants stole British jobs, resulting in unemployment and depressed wages, and that immigrants were responsible for much of the crime and poverty that afflicted the British slums. \textit{The Weekly Dispatch} asserted that the dangers of immigrants were so great that they should not be allowed to mix with the native English population: “Let [immigrants] take their automatic pistols, and their nitric acid, and their garlic and fleas, and their abominable philosophy of lust and laziness back to their countries where, no doubt, they will be sure of a cordial welcome – from the police!”\textsuperscript{421} \textit{The Jewish Chronicle} also blamed immigrants for the lapses of poor Englishmen into crime and immorality. The article contended that the immigrants of the East End created such a slime upon the streets that poor Englishmen slipped and fell from the path of goodness because of immigrant filth: “Poor Houndsditch…Your name stinks in the public nostrils…. For the stones of the streets of the East End would testify…of much that is shocking, much that is reprehensible. For the stones are the
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stones of mean streets over which poverty, hunger, dirt and disease form a slime that causes some to slip and tumble as they tread it in their perilous life-walk.”

Britons feared that the large numbers of immigrants congregating in areas, such as the East End, were creating alien islands of immigrants in poor, urban neighborhoods. They believed that the immigrants in these communities were a pestilence that would degrade and, potentially, destroy the nation. The public feared that such large immigrant communities possessed extreme individuals, including Anarchists, who would increase crime in English cities and infect the English citizens and otherwise peaceful immigrants that resided amongst them with the disease of Anarchism. In an editorial titled “Alien and Anarchist Influx,” the *Daily Mail* claimed that immigrants, “…for the most part are poverty-stricken, unskilled workers, with an exceedingly low standard of life, and they are reproducing in our midst the conditions of Wilna and Warsaw.” The article went on to assert that such communities of immigrants were no longer desired within England:

We know now that there is in the east of London a foreign city with 200,000 alien inhabitants and that in the rest of England there are probably quite as many more of these strangers. In Manchester, Leeds, and Glasgow, not to mention other cities, communities are growing up like that of Stepney. It is not to the point that a large majority of these people are law-abiding folk. The question is whether we want them at all and whether their presence in our densely populated State is not a cause of vast economic mischief and, indeed, of profound danger to the future of our race…

Sir Edward Goulding, MP for Worcester, spoke out vehemently against immigrants during a House of Commons debate on the 1911 Aliens Bill:

There is not only the alien who brings in his train of poverty and a lowering of the standard of life, but there is also the alien who, from the day he lands, abuses our hospitality, and is a scourge to
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the land…the anarchist of the dangerous type, who never associates himself with a lawful purpose, who comes here with the one motto and the one idea that there is no God and no master, and who thinks that he himself has a right to live without working, and kill without fighting. These are a danger to mankind and a curse to this country.424

The British public worried that these vast immigrant communities, or ‘alien islands,’ would expand until they became so prevalent that the English landscape and demography would be altered to the point that they no longer resembled the British conception of the nation. In other words, the British public feared that immigrants would transform England into a foreign land that was no longer perceived by Englishmen as England. The *Pall Mall Gazette* on 5 January 1911 displayed the audacious headlines, “The Alien Capture of Stepney: A Surviving Englishman’s Experience,” and “Britons Scorned as ‘Dirty Christians’: Transforming a Whole District.” The articles claimed to quote an anonymous and “afraid English writer” who resided in Stepney. According to the anonymous writer, twenty-five years earlier, when Stepney was home to fewer immigrants, the immigrant population had asserted that they would transform Stepney into their own land: “Yes, that was the time when the alien Jews boasted that they were going to capture not only Stepney, but also the whole of London, without firing a shot.” The writer, returning his focus to the modern day, concluded that by 1911 the immigrants had succeeded: “Well, they have captured Stepney, and the danger is rapidly spreading.”425 The *Daily Mail* also asserted that immigrants were transforming England and would eventually outnumber British citizens: “…the emigration of hale, able-bodied Englishmen has doubled in ten years, and their place is taken by the poverty-stricken non-British stream of immigrants from the Continent, we see that what is proceeding is the substitution of an inferior kind of man for a
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Thus, the Houndsditch Affair and the Siege of Sydney Street intensified the British public’s perception that immigrants were flooding into and overrunning England, and the public became increasingly concerned regarding the potential for immigrants to destroy the nation and the Empire.

The proponents of such doomsday rhetoric argued that it was the duty of the Government to protect British citizens, the true members of the nation, and to do so the State needed to purge dangerous immigrants from England. A prominent police official argued that the Government should establish extensive legal restrictions upon immigration: “All aliens coming into this country should be required to show a certificate of good character from the police, or similar authority, in their own country, together with a certificate of health, and they should be required to show that they have at least £10.”

Similarly, the City Corporation of London issued a public statement that the Government should direct “the deportation and exclusion of undesirable aliens from the United Kingdom.” Comparing the Government’s duties to those of a householder, another article recommended,

> Just as the presence of a typhoid bacillus in the milk should be a warning to the careful householder to procure his supply from a source free from dirt and contamination of every kind, so a statesman may regard the advent and subsequent exploits of a dangerous alien criminal as a reminder that in the end the arrival of strangers must be regulated for the benefit of those he represents.

Many observers argued that other countries successfully protected their populations from immigrants through strict government interventionism: “In the United States of America…the
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Immigration Laws and regulations are severe, and they are strictly enforced.\textsuperscript{430} Evans Gordon pressed for Britain to take similarly harsh measures; he stated, “[the Government] ought to weed out alien undesirables with a firm hand.”\textsuperscript{431}

\textbf{ii. THE BRITISH PUBLIC PERCEIVES THAT POOR SOCIAL CONDITIONS CREATE ANARCHISTS}

Englanders commonly interpreted the Houndsditch Affair and the Siege of Sydney Street as a sign that British society and civilization were crumbling. An article in \textit{The Morning Post} claimed, “The outburst of savagery was no mere chance and isolated phenomenon. It was the symptom of a disease which urgently calls for treatment.”\textsuperscript{432} Within these crimes, the British public witnessed what they believed to be the consequences of many pre-existing social concerns, including the moral, ethical, and physical problems of highly concentrated, lower-class industrial neighborhoods and the plight of urban laborers. Many observers employed the use of infection, contamination and illness as metaphors for Britain’s social problems. An article in \textit{The Morning Post} urged citizens to act upon the abject poverty and social decline of the urban poor, stating, “England must bestir herself and purge the country of the pestilence.”\textsuperscript{433} Another observer noted that if England did not effectively deal with its urban slums then it must accept that “the moral and practical dangers inseparable from these conditions [will] increase.”\textsuperscript{434} Though the British public was already aware of the social concerns which characterized large industrial cities, the Sydney Street Outrage gave them a new and deeper sense of urgency and
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convinced the public that social and political turmoil were near at hand. A letter to the editor of *The Morning Post* indicated what would happen if Britain failed to act: “It is somewhat of a relief to see the public awakening to the condition of matters in England. It seems to be little short of racial suicide that we are aiming at.”

For many individuals, the crimes’ location in the East End, an already notoriously impoverished working-class neighborhood, highlighted the dangers associated with poor urban settlements. Shortly after the Houndsditch Affair and the Siege of Sydney Street, numerous articles questioned whether the East End was a threat to the British nation. *The Times* of 13 January contended that most of the residents of the East End were part of a class of people predisposed towards Anarchism; it asserted,

> One need not be a pessimist and yet own that in these days there are fairly common temptations and impulses which bring about in certain natures something not unlike the spirit of Anarchism. The able bodied pauper who tears up bed-linen or assaults an attendant in the workhouse because the official beer is not strong enough or the soup to his taste; the prisoner who is always in trouble by reason of his inborn repugnance to rules is in his way a sort of Anarchist.

An anonymous public official from the East End echoed this claim: “In a sense these wretched people who crowd the East-end are all Anarchists. They come from many countries, and represent social classes which are permeated with the one idea that they are down-trodden and unjustly treated.” In the eyes of the British public, the East End appeared as a dark, shadowy land where the enemies of the nation could reside in obscurity from the police, the Government and the rest of society. One observer cautioned that beneath the surface, the East End was
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populated by individuals who “recognize no law, and who respect neither life nor property.”

Another critic alleged that it was filled with “nests of brigandage and murder.”

_The Daily Telegraph_ asserted that the East End was more dangerous than a foreign army:

> The peace of mind of the soldiers at the front must be considered also...what will be the feelings of the young Territorial who hears that riotous mobs are sweeping the London streets, murdering, burning, and pillaging? Will he not be sorely tempted to return to defend his loved ones from these fiends rather than remain with his regiment at the front? If the worst comes to the worst he knows that they have less to fear from the invader than from the East-end scum, for the former will at least observe the usages of war, whilst the latter acknowledges personal lust as his only guiding principle.

A pervasive view emerged that blamed dire social conditions for the presence of crime in working-class urban neighborhoods, such as the East End. Commentators decried the pitiable living conditions experienced by the urban working-classes; Evans Gordon reported, “In one small room there were three men, two women, and five children. The passage approaching the room was let as a living-room. All was most filthy. Filth and excrement was all over the landing and in the corners of the rooms. The stench arising was awful.”

According to many experts, the wider British public had ignored these conditions within England; the problems faced by the poor urban masses had been of little concern to the middle- and upper-classes. After the Sydney Street Outrage many writers argued that the desperate want of basic necessities could drive an honest person into crime; one writer to _The Morning Post_ averred that a person “may be perfectly honest one day and a criminal the next” because crime “is largely the result of...environment.” Similar claims were repeated in an article in _The Spectator_ titled
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“Criminology and Common-Sense.” The article denounced opinions that “regard criminals as being predestined to crime.”443 Rather, the article insisted that even simple material deprivations played an enormous role in crime: “It is doubtful whether anyone to whom soap and water and more or less tidy clothes are a matter of course can rightly estimate the extent to which this question of clothes and cleanliness bears upon the criminality of youth.”444 A letter allegedly from a young East End man in the same article revealed the banality many came to see in crime:

I can’t make a living I have tried hard, and failed it seems I am a hopeless case I can’t afford to pay my rent I have took room with my mother I don’t know what to do I am broke through no fault of my own. I am going to try once more to get on and if I fail I will give it up and say I am hopeless for good and all and retire from any calling or profession I am upset and don’t know what to do I am at times at loggerheads with everyone and fit to do anything crooked. I don’t want to try it I have kept out of jail for two years and a half I should not like to go crook again. If things do not alter I am very much afraid I am done. But I would like to keep Strait.445

Thus, what emerged after the Sydney Street Outrage was a sense that the East End was indeed dangerous to the nation but not necessarily because of the inherent nature of its residents. Instead, the British public began to believe that poverty and destitute living conditions created extreme individuals, such as Anarchists. Therefore, poverty was a problem that required the efforts and attention of the entire nation and not just a problem for charitable organizations and those affected by it. The individualism and minimalist Government that had characterized nineteenth-century England no longer seemed a viable option for managing England’s poor if the nation was to survive.

The Sydney Street Outrage also engendered a new view of Britain’s labor problems. Throughout much of the nineteenth century, the Government had retained a \textit{laissez-faire} attitude
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toward domestic labor issues, such as unemployment and depressed wages. However, these issues became intermingled with the perceived threat of Anarchism following the Houndsditch Affair and Siege of Sydney Street. In particular, pundits argued that the greater British public had just realized the dangers of Anarchist immigrants, such as the Houndsditch murderers, but England’s industrial workers faced the threat of Anarchist immigrants every day. A letter to the editor of *The Morning Post* argued that the Government’s liberal policies were responsible for the desperation of many urban workers; it stated, “In this so-called ‘Free’ Trade country, where we cannot find sufficient work for our own people, we allow foreigners to come in with practically no restrictions, to take the bread out of the mouths of our working men and women.”⁴⁴⁶ The author further contended that the Government needed to actively protect the interests of English workers by establishing a substantial poll tax, which would limit access into England to wealthier foreigners who would not compete for working-class jobs.⁴⁴⁷ Sir George Woodman, a member of the London Immigration Board, denounced the Government’s disregard for English workers: “I think we should first show our sympathy for our own people rather than waste it upon those who come here to make social and economic conditions far worse.”⁴⁴⁸ According to Woodman, poor immigrants drove down the wages of already poverty-stricken English workers; he claimed, “These alien immigrants, it should be remembered, come here and compete for the poorest-paid labour.”⁴⁴⁸

Like so many issues following the crimes at Houndsditch and Sydney Street, the plight of labor became seen as a national threat rather than one of partisan politics. An article titled “The Alien Tailor: Crushing Out the British Workingmen,” noted, “…the British tailor, whatever his
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politics, is agreed on one point – the foreigner has lowered the conditions of his trade.”

Interestingly, the Victorian belief that poor people were merely low-quality people who were responsible for their miserable lot in life was not necessarily revoked by 1911. Instead, by 1911, the fact that the poor masses were inferior people who had fashioned their own despair became irrelevant. Regardless of whether or not the poor deserved such miserable living conditions, the British public began to perceive the plight of the poor as a concern for the entire nation. Because the derelict social conditions endured by the urban poor could propagate embittered and violent Anarchists, these conditions became the concern of all Englanders rather than a cause relegated to sympathetic benefactors. When social issues, such as labor and poverty, were reframed within the generalized threat of Anarchism, they gained an increased sense of urgency as well as the implication that they were problems for the country at large and not just the interests of a select group.

The Houndsditch Affair and the Siege of Sydney Street gave rise to a marked feeling of national degeneration. The British public perceived that Anarchists threatened their very society and civilization. Many pre-existing social concerns were reinterpreted in this light: poverty became a condition that created Anarchists; unemployment and depressed wages resulted from Anarchist immigrants stealing British jobs; and immigration became the contamination of the nation by Anarchists. Therefore, social problems that had previously been of little concern to the middle- and upper-classes were increasingly understood to be matters of national survival in the war against Anarchism and, therefore, became matters of national concern.
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iii. THE FEAR OF ANARCHISTS CREATES AN ERA OF NEGATIVE INTEGRATION WITHIN BRITISH SOCIETY

An interesting facet of the exclusionary nationalist fervor that arose following the Sydney Street Outrage was that it was highly fluid and did not result in the exclusion of all immigrant groups. Various immigrant communities, as well social groups that had been previously excluded from proper British society, attempted to gain a rightful place in the British nation by distancing themselves from Anarchists. By illustrating how their group members differed from Anarchists, these groups attempted to minimize their differences with proper British society. Instead, these groups highlighted their similarities to upstanding British citizens and the benefits they offered to England. Through this newly developing ideal of what a ‘good’ Briton was and was not, many of these previously marginalized peoples were able to become valuable assets to the British public and, thus, become included in the nation.

Although some immigrant groups had initiated attempts to distance themselves from Anarchism as early as 1900, it was not until the Houndsditch Affair and the Siege of Sydney Street that this effort began en masse. The Jews were among the first of the groups to highlight their dissimilarities with Anarchists. The accusation by witnesses that the couple who had rented the apartment featured in the Houndsditch Affair appeared Jewish in origin ensured that the case tapped into popular, though not necessarily pervasive, currents of anti-Semitism. Historians have shown that while all newcomers to Britain faced some degree of hostility, the Jewish refugees from the Russian Pale of Settlement endured more than most, especially in London where they were concentrated.\textsuperscript{450} Contemporary works, including Arnold White’s \textit{The Modern...}

Jew (1899) and Joseph Banister’s *England under the Jews* (1901), had helped to spread the myth that Jews were an inherently lecherous breed who tended to follow criminal pursuits, and accusations of their involvement in crimes so widely vilified as the Sydney Street Outrage only furthered the negative associations between Jews and Anarchists.

Jewish immigrants, no doubt fearful of the recent anti-Semitism over the Dreyfus Affair in France and the Jack the Ripper case in England, attempted to assert their membership in the nation by distancing themselves from the dangers associated with Anarchists. Several immigrant Jews argued that Judaism itself precluded Anarchist sympathies; in a letter to the editor of *The Daily Telegraph*, Louis H.S. Goldschmidt contended, “it cannot be too widely known that Anarchism and lawlessness are diametrically opposed to Judaism.”<sup>451</sup> A Jewish rabbi made a similar claim in an article in *The Morning Post*; he stated, “Judaism is the very negation of Anarchism. The watchword of the Jew is: ‘I am a Hebrew and I fear the Lord God of Heaven and of earth.’ Judaism inculcates the duty of patriotism and obedience to the laws of our country.”<sup>452</sup> Other Jewish commentators argued that the Jewish population of Britain also favored the exclusion of the dangerous types of aliens. One writer noted, “…the [Jewish] community would welcome the strengthening of a measure intended to keep from these shores the lawless criminal who has become a common danger.”<sup>453</sup> Similarly, a public statement from the Jewish Board of Deputies, the representative body of the Anglo-Jewish Community, claimed, “…no one was more anxious to exclude the criminals than the Jewish community.”<sup>454</sup> Other Jewish immigrants argued that Jews, in general, committed very little crime. An article in *The Daily Telegraph*, 16 January 1911.
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*Daily Telegraph* asserted, “…90 per cent. of the Jews in the East-end had never been inside a police court.”

In addition, Jewish residents argued that the Jewish community was beneficial to British society. According to Louis Goldschmidt, “…it is only necessary to consult the police and Christian Clergy to ascertain the fact that since the settlement of the Alien Jew in the East-end, the conditions have vastly improved as far as law and order are concerned.” Jewish claims for inclusion were also reflected by some in the wider public. Immediately following the Houndsditch Affair an English physician penned a letter to *The Daily Chronicle* and asserted, “…the East-end Jews, who are, as a rule, a quiet, industrious, law-abiding people…” The Archbishop of York also avowed, “I know no steadier, better conducted, or more hard-working race of people than the Jewish aliens in London.” Thus, by exploiting the ambiguous nature of the Anarchist danger, the immigrant Jewish community in England attempted to avoid exclusion from the nation by marking themselves as proper, law-abiding members of society.

In the wake of the Houndsditch and Sydney Street crimes some critics also associated Socialism with Anarchism. Sir Robert Anderson noted that Socialists were, “I will not say brothers, but near cousins to the Anarchists.” Anderson contended that although Socialists did not typically use violent means, they produced just as much damage through their propaganda: “Evil principles…often do more harm than evil practices.” Based on this belief, he declared that the Socialist Party’s recent entrance into the House of Commons posed a grave threat. He stated, “The recent parliamentary elections gave proof that the socialists alienate the electorate…a doctrinaire who preaches socialism, whether as a Minister of State on a political platform or as a
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minister of religion in a Nonconformist pulpit, makes many converts to that pestilently evil propaganda." Others found similar connections between the alleged Anarchist threat and Socialism. Justice Grantham, in an interview for *The Daily Telegraph*, alleged that Anarchists were merely “Socialists of the very worst type – men who did not acknowledge God or anything.” An article in *The Morning Post* argued that Socialism was just a slippery slope on the path to Anarchism and asserted that the Government should guard against the influence of Socialism:

> Not, of course, that the government has any sympathy with the assassins; but the ordinary commonsense of Englishmen would tell ‘em that all this pandering to you Socialists that’s been going on under Asquith is just walking along the road that leads to the place these men have got to. It’s not a great way from the Mile End Pavilion to Sydney-Street.  

Socialists, meanwhile, insisted that Anarchism and Socialism were nothing alike. Socialists distanced themselves from Anarchism and stressed that the Socialist movement sought to grow and enhance the British State not abolish it. Socialists asserted that their goal was not the destruction of the Government but rather the enhancement of the Government. They cited the peacefulness of their protests and avowed that their efforts aimed to increase the size and involvement of the British Government to enhance the lives of all citizens not just themselves. They highlighted the Anarchist’s love of the individual and separated themselves from the Anarchist’s individualism. Socialism, they claimed, denounced individualism and only embraced actions that benefitted greater British society. An article in the *Daily Express*, printed in January 1911, illustrated the Socialists’ eschewing of Anarchism and their argument for inclusion:
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Philosophically the Anarchist is an extreme individualist, and as such is the antithesis of the State Socialist, although he shares with the Socialist a desire to destroy the present economic basis of society. That is the only connection between the two schools... Socialism, particularly as it has been developed by Mr. Sydney Webb and the Fabian thinkers, means the elaborate organization of society. Starting from the State acquisition of land and the instruments of production and developing into a bureaucracy under which efficiently will be carried to the point of madness. It is specifically admitted that under such Socialism there will be no academic regard for either liberty, fraternity, or equality. The liberty in every case is to be subordinate to the State – except in the case of the highly-placed bureaucrat...The Socialist desires the greatest possible amount of government. The Anarchist is the enemy of all government.  

As stated previously, the location of these crimes within the East End focused the nation on the dangers of poverty and unemployment. Many East End residents, including immigrants, opposed the generalizations that equated poverty and unemployment with lawlessness. One such inhabitant contended in *The Toynbee Record*,

> Those of us who live in East London and know something of its daily life feel deep regret that our neighbors should be so misjudged as they have been in consequence of what has occurred. Whitechapel is treated as a land of foreign pirates and strange criminal conspirators; it is imagined that it is dangerous to live and work here, though there are few healthier or safer districts in London; the criminal act of a tiny group of most untypical outlaws...has been made the basis of a fierce campaign against a large number of harmless men and women who had neither sympathy nor connection with them.  

East End inhabitants claimed that, despite their poverty, the majority of the local population, including immigrants, was of a character unlike that of Anarchists. They asserted that most East End residents were moral and God-fearing people who worked diligently in British industries and obeyed British laws. An article in *The Daily Telegraph* mirrored these assertions, stating that the great majority of the people in the East End were “peaceful, law-
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abiding people, desirous of earning their livelihood quietly and honestly.”

The Morning Post printed a letter regarding immigrants in the East End, averring,

The experience of the police and the statistics of crime show that the gradual increase of foreign-born inhabitants in Whitechapel has been accompanied by a steady decrease of breaches of the law: in particular, social workers all bear witness to the strong family affection, the sober habits, and quiet-loving dispositions of the great majority of these good neighbors of ours.

The Daily Chronicle reported on the masses of poor East End residents that bore witness to the Houndsditch funeral procession as an indication of the East End’s widespread sympathy and support of the fallen officers:

…as the procession passed on into narrow streets and into poorer districts…The poor of London had come out…The people of the underworld, the people who struggle for a living wage, the people of mean streets and squalid lodging-houses…All along the route there were great silent crowds of humble citizens, and all through Whitechapel many of the faces were those of foreigners, dark-eyed, sallow, of many different types, from many nations.

While the British public was pontificating on the dangers of immigrants and poverty in communities such as the East End, Englishmen residing in the East End objected to being vilified by comparisons to the Houndsditch Anarchists and touted the virtues of the East End’s residents as moral and hard-working members of society, even when those residents were immigrants.

Certain immigrant groups also attempted to distance themselves from Anarchism. Russians and Eastern Europeans were strongly associated with Anarchism by 1910, and many Russian and Eastern European immigrants condemned the actions of the Houndsditch criminals and distanced themselves from Anarchism. Lithuanians, for example, were often confused with Latvians, a nationality strongly associated with Anarchism, and Lithuanians strove to explain to
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the British public that they were not Latvians, despite being neighboring countries. An article titled “VINDICATED LITHUANIANS” asserted that Lithuanians bore no similarity to their Latvian neighbors and were inherently opposed to Anarchism:

Father Mathulaitis, the only Lithuanian priest in London, yesterday declared that it was almost impossible for the murders to have been committed by Lithuanians…Their very temperament…is utterly foreign to acts of violence, even amongst themselves. Their salient characteristics are peacefulness and orderliness. They never carry firearms, and always keep strictly to themselves…The only explanation I can offer for the linking of the Lithuanians with the outrages is their proximity of origin to the Letts. But they are as different from each other as it is possible to imagine of such closely mingled people…I believe that the Lithuanians, just as much as any other foreigner in this country, feel the greatest indignation at the outrages.467

*The Morning Post* printed a letter from “A Russian Reader.” The Russian author denounced the Houndsditch and Sydney Street crimes and implored the British public for mercy and understanding:

It appears that the disgusting crime perpetrated by outlaws of Russian nationality has created ill-feeling towards all Russians living in England…The people as a whole cannot be made responsible for the horrible crime committed by their countrymen… it should be the duty of a civilised nation to give its moral support to those who are struggling for a better life. It will be an inhuman and short-sighted law that will brand all the Russians about to come to this country as criminals or suspects.468

Numerous social groupings, including Jews, Socialists, the urban poor, and Russian and Eastern European immigrants attempted to garner membership in the British nation through a campaign of negative integration. By distancing themselves from Anarchism and by highlighting their benefit to England, previously marginalized or excluded organizations and ethnicities strove to find a place within proper British society. Certain groups, such as Eastern
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European and Russian immigrants, had little success, while other social entities, such as Socialists and the urban poor, were granted greater inclusion within British society. Advocacy for the urban poor and increased public support for the development of State sponsored-welfare programs was enhanced by the poor’s efforts to distance themselves from Anarchists, and Socialists gained an exponentially greater role in Government after 1910. Although many factors contributed to the emerging presence of Socialists in Government, the movement’s push to segregate themselves from Anarchism and focus on the ways in which they could benefit the British nation no doubt aided their acceptance by the greater British public.\textsuperscript{469} In the 1900 election, Socialists joined the House of Commons for the first time, due in part to a single, united Socialist party, but they only acquired two MPs. By 1922, however, the Socialist party, the Labor Party, had won 142 seats in the House of Commons, and the following year, 1923, the Labor Party gained control in Parliament and heralded Ramsey Macdonald as its first Prime Minister. Thus, by explaining to the British people how unlike Anarchists they were and how their presence actually enhanced British society and the safety of the State, some previously excluded groups, such as Socialists, were able to transition from a life on the fringes of British society to inclusion in the nation as welcome and valuable members.

C. THE BRITISH PUBLIC’S FEAR OF ANARCHISTS RECONCEPTUALIZES THE PUBLIC’S IMAGE OF A “SAFE” ENGLISH STATE

As fear and anxiety built in response to the Sydney Street Outrage, many individuals turned to an in depth analysis of the Government and the current political parties. Although the

\textsuperscript{469} The Labour Party gained 42 seats in the House of Commons in 1910, and by 1922 that number had climbed to 142, and the First Labour majority formed a government under Ramsay MacDonald. See Henry Pelling and Alastair J. Reid, \textit{A Short History of the Labour Party}, 2005.
perception that Anarchists were a problem for State had been growing since the Greenwich Outrage and had become quite pervasive by the end of the Tottenham Outrage, the Houndsditch Affair and the Siege of Sydney Street firmly solidified in the public mind that the English Government must address Anarchism. Anarchist outrages were perceived as a national problem, and many British citizens questioned the why the leadership of the Liberal Party in Government refused to recognize the Anarchist threat. Many critics were convinced that the State’s liberal policies had permitted the litany of Anarchist crimes to occur, and other observers lamented that the liberal ideologies of the Victorian era could not control the Anarchist crisis that was overtaking England. As a result, the political ideologies of the British Government were redefined following the Houndsditch and Sydney Street crimes by their propensity to shelter Anarchists or their ability to control Anarchists.

i. CRITICS BLAME LIBERALISM FOR ENGLAND’S ANARCHIST MENACE

England’s Liberal Party, recently reelected to a slim majority in the House of Commons in 1910, was an easy target on which to pin the blame for these crimes, especially given the visible presence of Winston Churchill at the siege. Many members of the Conservative minority, both active and retired, led the attack on the ruling party. Some critics emphasized that Liberal politicians had blocked alien restriction bills proposed by the Conservative Party in the 1890’s, bills, they claimed, that would have prevented the entrance of immigrant Anarchists, such as the Houndsditch and Sydney Street criminals. These critics further charged that when the Aliens Act of 1905 was eventually passed, the Liberals had only allowed it to pass in a thoroughly ineffective form. In a widely reprinted article, Evans Gordon, a retired Conservative M.P. and
one of the chief architects of the 1905 Aliens Act, accused the Liberals of undermining alien restrictions because of their petty political prejudices. The Liberal Parliamentarians, he stated, “…without regard to the facts at issue, opposed the Aliens Bills of 1904 and 1905 simply because they were Unionist measures.” Furthermore, Evans Gordon asserted that the Liberal Party, which had assumed control of the Government and the administration of the Aliens Act with their electoral victory in 1906, strove to render the act completely moribund: “They provided by administrative order, in direct contravention to the statute, that any destitute alien who chose to describe himself as a political refugee should be exempt from exclusion.” The result, he averred, “…was that entry into this country became free to any greedy ruffian from Eastern Europe who chose to say that he was ‘persecuted’ in his own land, and thus the door was opened wide to such persons as those who perpetrated the Tottenham and Houndsditch crimes.”470

Anderson appealed to the readers of The Nineteenth Century and After that his long experience as former head of the Secret Service Department in the Home Office and as former Chief of the Criminal Investigation Department at Scotland Yard gave him unique insight into the mismanagement of the Aliens Act. He argued that the Liberal Government was to blame for the circumstances that caused the present crimes; according to Anderson, the Liberals’ “idea of liberty is the right of every man to do as he likes,” no matter how dangerous his desires and actions are to his neighbors.471 An article in the Review of Reviews likened the Liberal ideology to the careless disregard of society exhibited by Anarchism. The article asserted that by opposing the protective tariffs proposed by the recent Declaration of London, Liberal politicians

471 Ibid.
had demonstrated “an exhibition of the spirit of reckless Anarchy which curiously resembles the agitation of Peter the Painter and his fellows in Houndsditch.”\(^{472}\)

Arguments that liberalism and the Liberal Party were to blame for the Sydney Street Outrage were echoed in the opinions of the wider public as well. A letter to the editor of *The Morning Post* asserted,

> In my opinion, the Houndsditch outrage should be followed by indignation meetings in every parish in the Kingdom. The most material cause of the ineffective working of the Aliens Act is due to Radical misgovernment, and the people should have fully explained to them the difference between the Unionist Aliens Act of 1905 and the Radical weakness in rendering the easy evasion of its measures possible.\(^{473}\)

Another letter, in *The Times*, blamed the former leader of the Liberal Party for the current circumstances: “It is entirely due to the action of the late Home Secretary, Mr. Herbert Gladstone (now a wicked peer), that the operations of the [Aliens] Act were rendered non-effective, and this country is still an asylum for Anarchists, criminals, and the mentally and physically afflicted of all nations.”\(^{474}\) Critics who could not claim long Government experience often appealed to the public’s common sense. One individual writing to *The Morning Post* contended, “If I as a Householder harbour a criminal I am severely dealt with, but what about the criminal negligence in allowing this man to enter the country in the first place?”\(^{475}\) The magazine *Punch* presented a similar view in one of its political cartoons; the sketch depicted a lion keeper at a carnival securing the cage of two fierce looking lions. A young boy approaches the keeper and asks “Wot ‘ud ‘appen if they was to get loose?” The keeper, looking grave, replies, “Why, I’d get the sack

\(^{472}\) *Review of Reviews*, February 1911.
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sharp!\textsuperscript{476} Statements such as those portrayed in the \textit{Punch} cartoon, indicated that many Britons believed that the politicians responsible for allowing dangerous Anarchist individuals loose in England also deserved termination. The Anarchist crimes of Houndsditch and Sydney Street quickly became a language through which the British public could debate its current Government – from the Government’s members and policies to its underlying ideology. As a result, the status quo, associated with Gladstonian liberalism, was deemed unsafe in light of the emerging Anarchist menace.

ii. THE BRITISH PUBLIC ADVOCATES THE DEVELOPMENT OF A MORE INTERVENTIONIST GOVERNMENT

The British public widely believed that the Houndsditch Affair and the Siege of Sydney Street were signs that the British nation was entering a new era. The classical liberalism of the nineteenth century, which limited Government and emphasized the rights of the individual, was now considered to be inadequate against the menace of extreme individuals, such as Anarchists. According to one article in \textit{The Times}, “Some one has defined civilisation as being the incessant invention of new needs. It might also be defined as the incessant development of new difficulties and new dangers.”\textsuperscript{477} Meanwhile \textit{The Morning Post} contended, “It is everywhere recognised that a real evil exists, and that in the interests of the public welfare some effective provision must be made to guard against a grave menace to the security and order of society.”\textsuperscript{478} As the nation appeared to many people to be in a war for survival, the public charged the Government with protecting the country. However, rather than battles waged on foreign lands,

\textsuperscript{476} \textit{Punch, or the London Charivari}, 25 January 1911. 
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the threat of Anarchism had to be fought on the home front. The Government, therefore, was increasingly perceived as being responsible for the regulation of the domestic population. Given the discourse on ‘public safety’ and ‘security’ in the face of an ‘evil’ enemy, the Sydney Street Outrage further solidified the view that the Government needed to develop tougher, more aggressive strategies to combat the Anarchist threat, including the abandonment of traditional liberal scruples. The media attacked Britain’s nineteenth-century culture of minimal Government and individual freedom as both outmoded and dangerous.

The violence of the Houndsditch Affair and excessive force present at the Siege of Sydney Street to apprehend two criminals enhanced the public’s belief that particularly dangerous Anarchist individuals were jeopardizing the nation. One description of Houndsditch suspect ‘Peter the Painter’ demonstrated the magnitude of the threat perceived by the British people:

‘Peter the Painter’ is still at large, and he appears to carry in his head one of the master-brains of the plot. There is reason to think that nine-tenths of his special gang are still loose; and there may be other gangs. For the complete creed of taking as you can and killing as you may has been propagated from Anarchist clubs in the East End, and the disciples may be numerous. The Anarchist criminals who perpetrated the Sydney Street Outrage were no longer isolated actors and, instead, represented the new class of extreme individuals, a class who was considered “a particularly murderous and reckless type of criminal.” Due to the overwhelming and unprecedented danger of these extreme Anarchist criminals, the British public was convinced that English police were ill-prepared to deal with the dangers of such malevolent men and could no longer rely on traditional means of fighting crime. *The Morning Post* contended that the police could not protect the public from the Houndsditch criminals because they were
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“handicapped by the English respect for liberty,” and a writer for Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine argued that the police “are neither trained nor armed to arrest criminals of the kind who defied them in this Stepney outrage.”

The Anarchist criminals who had committed the Tottenham and Sydney Street Outrages had carried and utilized powerful firearms while the British police had been unarmed and unprotected, and this concerned the British public. One writer noted that firearms were not common among English criminals, but he feared that the influence of Anarchist criminals would alter this practice: “It is unusual for an English burglar to be armed with a revolver and to use it…It is not an English practice, but I daresay the example set by foreign criminals in this country has not been without its bad influence.”

The Divisional Commissioner of Police in Ireland insisted that refusing to arm British police was both unsafe and inhumane under the new circumstances: “It is not far from criminal to employ police in districts where they have to deal with anarchists and other desperadoes…” Another article asserted that moral force alone would not stop extreme Anarchist individuals: “What is the use of ‘moral force’ when you come face to face with a foreign desperado who knows of no other force than ‘physical’? To cope with the devices of the foreign criminal or Anarchist you must meet him on his own ground.”

A correspondent for The Morning Post contended that the United States was safer than England because American police carried and used firearms to keep the criminal classes in order; in America, he stated, “The police take no chances. At night a man who is commanded to halt by a policeman and ignores the command takes his life in his hands, for the policeman will shoot first
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Many critics also advocated the establishment of harsher punishments for criminals. Anderson, for example, claimed that corporeal punishment was appropriate for the new type of criminal; he stated, “In every case the punishment should be such as will deter the offender from committing a similar crime again. This is exactly what our system does not do. We must therefore devise another system…If necessary we will resort to the gallows.”

Previously, violent, restrictive and punitive police methods had been scorned by the British public as a violation of an individual’s human rights. However, in the wake of the Sydney Street Outrage, it became common to suggest that such liberal and humanitarian concerns were now misplaced. “Humanitarians may complain and talk of respect for human life”, wrote The Morning Post, “but there is no doubt that the criminal, and especially the Anarchist, who cares nothing for the lives of his fellows, would be far more respectful of the forces of law if he knew that once caught red-handed he would be mercilessly hunted down and shot without appeal.” Other press reports called for the creation of more intense systems of censorship, surveillance and civilian registration to stamp out evil ideas and keep track of potentially dangerous groups of individuals. Writing in The Daily Telegraph, a retired police inspector insisted, “…when one is dealing with such dangerous characters as recent events have disclosed some sort of registration seems to become essential for the protection of the inhabitants here.” According to The Weekly Dispatch, “The man who objects to [a registration system] on the ground of interference with the sacred liberty of the subject ought to consult a physician:
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there is something wrong with his head.” At a time when liberalism was already being undermined and questioned, the Houndsditch Affair and the Siege of Sydney Street provided a new and powerful argument for more invasive and authoritarian forms of Government.

The clamor for police reform was not the only demand for reform that highlighted the public’s transition from traditional liberalism to a stricter and more interventionist Government; they also advocated for stricter regulations on immigration. The British public insisted that the State must determine which immigrants were safe and worthy to gain entry into the nation. Britons further advocated that those immigrants who were admitted should be monitored and policed to ensure they did not pose a danger to English citizens. Immediately following the Houndsditch Affair, the *Daily Express* published a letter, asserting that the British Government needed to recognize the dangers of unrestricted immigration and enact significant change: “If [the Houndsditch murders] should have the effect of teaching our legislators the crime of turning a deaf ear to those who decry the unrestricted migration of criminals and Anarchists, these brave men will not have died in vain.” A similar letter stated, “We hope this catastrophe will induce our Government to enforce the Aliens Act more strictly, and thus prevent the criminals of the Continent being dumped on our shores to prey on and murder peaceful citizens.” *The Daily Telegraph* published a February 1911 statement commanding the Government to direct “the deportation and exclusion of undesirable aliens from the United Kingdom” and regulate and control those allowed to stay. *The Morning Post* contended that monitoring and vetting potentially Anarchist immigrants was beyond the scope of Scotland Yard and averred that England’s Government needed to create an International Vigilance Bureau to regulate and
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monitor potential immigrants. The author also asserted that such an organization should coordinate across international borders to suppress dangerous individuals who were attempting to migrate to Britain’s shores.\textsuperscript{494} The \textit{Daily Mail} concurred that the enforcement of the Aliens Act and the regulation of immigrants were matters for the Government and not the simply the police. An article titled “ENFORCE THE ALIEN’S ACT” described a room where soldiers and police shooting at the two Anarchists during the Siege of Sydney Street had been stationed, and the article claimed that the dangers faced by the soldiers and officers in that room had been even greater than the dangers of war:

\begin{quote}
It was as terrible a vigil as any in that room had ever kept, and there were soldiers there who had served through the South African war…But here they were not dealing with an enemy whose conduct was governed by any of the conventions of war, but one who would shoot down a defenseless woman or child as readily as any one representing law and order.\textsuperscript{495}
\end{quote}

Englanders encouraged greater Government involvement in domestic affairs as well, further abandoning nineteenth-century liberalism in favor of a more paternalistic State. In the aftermath of the Houndsditch and Sydney Street crimes Britons began to speculate on the connection between poor living conditions and Anarchism. They worried that the unemployment, depressed wages, brutal working environments and abject poverty of the urban slums would foster the growth of Anarchism out of the despair and desperation of its inhabitants. The \textit{Daily Express} highlighted the atrocious working conditions of the East End poor and argued that the Government was neglecting these citizens, abandoning them to the hardship and despair of poverty, where they would inevitably find salvation in any cause that claimed to better their wretched lives. Although the British Government had instigated laws to protect urban workers, the author averred that the existing laws were inadequate and needed to be strengthened:
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Many tragedies are hidden behind the curtained but lighted windows which are to be seen in the East End ‘Triangle’ during all the hours of darkness. Within men – and often women – saw and press and cut clothes throughout the night and early morning, as well as the daytime, for a wage that barely supports life...Ceaseless efforts are made by women factory inspectors to prevent the sweating of women and girls in this manner, but their numbers are quite inadequate – there are only seventeen women inspectors for more than 1,500,000 women and girl workers in the factories and workshops of the United Kingdom – and the evil continues almost unchecked.496

Meanwhile, The Morning Post argued that the Government was favoring immigrants over English workers by allowing poor immigrants into England who would accept any meager wage. The article claimed, “Only the other day I came across the case of an Englishman, a waiter by profession, who was unable to get a job because...the managers of most hotels, being foreigners themselves, gave preference to men of their own country.” Therefore, the author concluded, the State should impose a large poll tax on immigrants to ensure that they do not steal jobs from the working-classes. 497

Although many Englanders advocated for harsher methods of law enforcement and stricter, more interventionist policies, such as censorship and registration, initially such radical changes were met with criticism from those who felt that individual liberties must be protected. Numerous Britons deemed that a national surveillance agency was necessary to supplement the police, but a contingent of the population feared that such measures would eventually impair the liberty of all British citizens rather than just those of extreme individuals. An article in The Spectator summed up this view: “…it is impossible to invent really effectual means [for surveillance] short of denying liberty of thought and of freedom for people who are not known criminals to come and go. What is an Anarchist? How is he to be defined? How is he to be
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known at sight?” Furthermore, the article stated that legitimate political activity would be repressed: “…it is not suggested, we hope, that no meeting for any kind of political discussion shall be held without the permission of the police or unless the police are present. Rules like that lead to a hue and cry from one end to the other of our private life.”

However, such idealistic opinions were gradually drowned in a sea of criticism which claimed that England’s liberties were irresponsible and dangerous. A cartoon in *Punch* titled “The Bitter Cry of the Undesirable” mocked the protection of individual liberties. In the cartoon, two foreign-looking ruffians, one armed with a knife and the other with a pistol, stood, hiding in a dark alley. One “criminal alien” said to the other, “This country won’t be quite so snug an asylum for us one of these days. They’ll stop us carrying arms for self-defence.” The other “criminal alien” replied, “Yes, and deport us on suspicion before we’ve killed anybody.”

When being questioned on the subject of immigrant registration, a retired police inspector averred, “Sentimentalists might object, but when one is dealing with such dangerous characters as recent events have disclosed, some sort of registration seems to become essential for the protection of the inhabitants here.” Anderson also stated that safety should come before liberty: “If there is a public danger you must take means to guard against it, and if some system of registration of aliens would have that effect, why not adopt it?” Alfred Fellows took this reasoning even farther and insisted that any means and expense required for immigrant registration were worth the effort to guard the nation; he claimed, “…the new burden ought to prove an extremely good investment.”
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Sydney Street, the safety of the nation was deemed more important than the liberty of the individual and that safety, according to many commentators, could only be found by increasing the Government’s intervention in the domestic realm.

D. CONCLUSION

The Sydney Street Outrage dominated press headlines into February 1911 when the moral panic and speculation concerning the crimes began to gradually subside. In the short term, the spectacle played a part in the decision of Home Secretary Winston Churchill – who was present at the Siege of Sydney Street – to introduce the Aliens (Prevention of Crime) Bill to the House of Commons on 18 April 1911.504 Churchill’s opening speech mirrored the fiery rhetoric of the earlier press coverage:

The man whom we have in mind in this provision is the man of whom we know nothing, and who knows nothing of us or of our institutions and peaceful life, who comes from a country where murder and violence are common, where every policeman is regarded as a foe, where every institution is regarded as tyranny, and where, to carry on a career of plunder and rapine like a fierce wild animal, may be deemed to be a romantic and even a respectable profession. I think we are entitled in these days, when communication is so cheap and easy – I go further and say I think we are bound – to arm ourselves with new powers in dealing with this class of person and to place ourselves in the position of being able to exact some guarantee which will enable us to protect our people from outrage and ill-usage. I do not think we are bound to wait until someone is actually murdered.505

The ensuing debates over the Aliens (Prevention of Crime) Bill in the House of Commons reflected the wide-ranging social and political concerns that had coalesced in the media coverage

504 Harry Defries claimed, “[the Aliens Bill] was undoubtedly motivated in part by the Siege of Sydney Street the previous January in which anarchist gunmen fought armed police and troops under the personal supervision Churchill.” H. Defries, Conservative Party Attitudes to Jews, 1900-1950, 2001. p. 356.
505 H. o. C. Debate, Hansards, 18 April 1911.
of the Houndsditch Affair and the Siege of Sydney Street and included suggestions for arming
the police, excluding immigrants from countries such as Russia and prohibiting aliens to own
firearms. In the end, however, the House of Commons failed to find broad agreement on which
measures were needed to guard against ‘undesirable aliens,’ and the bill was withdrawn after its
second reading on 4 December 1911.

The Sydney Street Outrage angered the British public to a greater extent than did the
Walsall, Greenwich and Tottenham Outrages. The Houndsditch Affair and the Siege of Sydney
Street firmly cemented in the British public’s mind the fear of Anarchists that had been
propagated by the previous outrages. Warnings issued by British citizens regarding the dangers
of Anarchism in the wake of the Tottenham Outrage had gone unheeded by the British
Government. Thus, after the Houndsditch and Sydney Street crimes the British people blamed
the Government for the atrocities committed by the Houndsditch Anarchists. Britons were
incensed that the State had not heeded the public’s seemingly prophetic counsel and had
needlessly subjected the nation to great peril. The British public widely believed that the
Government had performed wretchedly at the Siege of Sydney Street, allowing two men armed
with handguns to hold off over one thousand armed police and soldiers with artillery for several
hours. The State’s failure in the siege indicated to the public that the Government was not
capable of managing England’s Anarchist threat, and the public used this failure as evidence of
England’s need for massive social and political change.

The Houndsditch Affair and the Siege of Sydney Street preserved the Tottenham
Outrage’s legacy – immigrants were dangerous Anarchists – and after the Houndsditch and
Sydney Street crimes the British public no longer made a distinction between Anarchists and
immigrants. All immigrants equaled Anarchists, and British citizens automatically perceived
any debate on immigration as a debate on the acceptance of Anarchists into England. Immigrants were charged with contaminating the nation and creating ‘alien islands’ of disease and debauchery. Britons believed that immigrants transformed England’s working-class neighborhoods into foreign lands, overflowing with an abundance of immoral and Anarchist immigrants. They asserted that these ‘alien islands’ degraded the living and working conditions of the English poor residing among them and transformed otherwise honorable Englishmen into embittered Anarchists. British citizens also feared that the ‘alien islands’ of immigrants would spread across England and alter England until the nation no longer resembled the country that they currently knew. Thus, the Houndsditch Affair and the Siege of Sydney Street instilled within the British public a deep-seated conviction that immigration would destroy the nation, either through the degeneration English communities or through the transformation of England into a foreign land. Therefore, to protect the nation, English citizens declared that the Government must adopt new policies to restrict immigration and new techniques to monitor those immigrants already in Britain.

For numerous reasons the British public perceived that the nation was degenerating at the turn of the century, but the increasing violence and visibility of England’s Anarchist outrages and the Government’s inability to curtail Anarchism markedly intensified this opinion. The perceived deterioration of nation at this time became inexorably linked to the deplorable social conditions of the urban slums. The Sydney Street Outrage focused the public’s attention onto the country’s poor, working-class, and predominately immigrant, boroughs, such as the East End, and the media discussion following the crimes frequently debated the plight of the urban poor. The criminality and debased morals found in poor, urban communities, such as the East End, reminded the British public of the selfish nature and degraded morality of Anarchists.
As a result, many British citizens began to assert that the miserable social conditions experienced by the nation’s urban poor enhanced the poor’s susceptibility to Anarchism, especially when they were surrounded by immigrants preaching Anarchist ideals and lowering their standard of living. Thus, the English public began to believe that the declining social conditions in England’s urban slums endangered the nation by transforming poverty-stricken Englishmen and otherwise peaceful immigrants into Anarchists or Anarchist sympathizers. Under this view, the plight of the urban poor became a problem for the nation and not just one for an isolated group. The public’s newfound concern with England’s social problems extended to unemployment as well, as Britons alleged that immigrants stole British jobs and depressed wages. The public blamed the State for admitting these nefarious immigrants who, not only endangered the nation through their inherent flaws as immigrants, but also submitted the nation to further perils of Anarchism.

In the press following the Houndsditch Affair and the Siege of Sydney Street many groups were criticized by their perceived association with Anarchism. Jews, Russians, the urban poor, and Socialists were all linked to the plague of Anarchism in the days immediately following the crimes. These maligned collections of people denied their affiliation with Anarchism and adamantly asserted that they were nothing like Anarchists and contained no Anarchist leanings. To further increase their acceptance by British society, these groups attempted to highlight the ways in which their presence benefitted the British nation, either through their hard-working and decent natures or through their political or religious beliefs. By asserting that they were not Anarchists but were instead attributes to the British nation, these previously marginalized and excluded peoples attempted to gain inclusion into proper British society. Although the success of the Jewish community at gaining inclusion is arguable, some
groups, most notably the urban poor and the Socialists, attained acceptance through their campaign of negative integration. Other groups, however, namely Russian and Eastern European immigrants, were unable to distance themselves from their Anarchist shadows.

The British public blamed the Government, and especially the Liberal Party, for the Sydney Street Outrage. The public perceived that Government had made no attempt in the preceding years to prevent or control Anarchists in England, and many English citizens were convinced that the Government’s careless actions had actually promoted and protected Anarchists at the expense of British citizens. The public decried the sanctity of individual freedom espoused by traditional liberalism, believing that such devotion to the rights of the individual was responsible for the Anarchist menace threatening the nation. The massive military and State involvement at the funeral and again at the siege heightened the existing and pervasive perception that the nation was at war with Anarchism, and the failed nature of the siege and the overwhelming opinion that it had been botched intensified the public’s belief that the State was not equipped for such a war.

Numerous critics of the Government asserted that the existing British State could not handle the threat of Anarchism, and the Houndsditch and Sydney Street crimes elicited widespread calls for reform. Britons advocated more restrictive and interventionist provisions for the police, including arming all police officers, reinstating corporal punishments and introducing invasive surveillance protocols. Police reform, however, was just one of the ways in which the British people eschewed nineteenth-century liberalism and embraced a more paternalistic State. The public also demanded immigration reform, advocating the adoption of strict rules on which immigrants could enter England and extensive State-controlled policing and monitoring of England’s immigrant residents. English citizens also began to demand greater
State involvement in domestic matters, as well, as the British public began to view poverty and unemployment as problems that created Anarchists and endangered the nation. While some Britons expressed concern that these restrictions would violate the rights of upstanding British citizens, such views were soon obliterated by the widespread condemnation of these critics as sentimental fools. By 1911, most English citizens perceived that liberalism’s individual freedoms were, in large part, responsible for the Anarchist menace afflicting England. The Houndsditch Affair and the Siege of Sydney Street inflamed the turn of the century British climate, already infested with the disease of Anarchism, and in such a perilous climate, the English public believed that the liberal individual freedoms of the Victorian era were too outdated and dangerous to be allowed and, instead, advocated the adoption of a new, stricter and safer State.
VI.

CONCLUSION

“Our good nature and our magnanimous toleration are degenerating into weakness. Our passion for freedom amounts to a disease.”

_The Weekly Dispatch_ 8 Jan 1911.

A. OVERVIEW

The Anarchist outrages of Edwardian England became sensationalist and often irrational press spectacles. However, it was within that sensationalized and irrational framework that most Britons learned about the ideas and events of the time. For the majority of British citizens, the understanding and conceptualization of Anarchist violence and Edwardian age anxieties evolved within the framework of the sensationalized, and often unrealistic, press spectacle; the spectacle was how everyday Englanders understood the world around them. They did not perceive England and its problems through the speeches and stances of Government politicians or through windy Parliamentary debates. Instead, the masses understood the state of the nation through the political cartoons, lurid press exposés, and apocalyptic novels that characterized the Edwardian era.
Modern day scholars have dismissed many of the fears reproduced in the Edwardian mass media as unrealistic – immigration numbers were highly exaggerated, and Anarchist violence on the Continent and, particularly, in England was not nearly as prevalent or as ruthless as the press claimed. However, the modern day understanding of fin-de-siècle anxieties was not the reality experienced by those living in Edwardian England; the public debate and discourse of the age occurred largely within the spectacle that was the sensationalist turn of the century press. Despite the very small presence of Anarchists within Britain and the very high possibility that many of the Anarchist outrages were not committed by Anarchists at all, the British presses worked the fear of Anarchism into a national fervor, and the fear of Anarchism in England played a crucial role in the British public’s conception of the nation. Anarchism in England morphed into a persona that had little to do with Anarchism but, instead, encapsulated the myriad of anxieties vexing Britons at the turn of the century and gave those fears space and expression for public debate.

While the Government did not agree on how to best respond to the Anarchist outrages that plagued the nation from 1892 to 1911, the outrages became a lexicon for the British public to understand and express the anxieties of their time. The Anarchist criminals responsible for these crimes confirmed the fears that had been plaguing the British populous since the first Anarchist outrage in Walsall and condensed these fears into one easily accessible topic – Anarchism.

During its transition from a political movement to a national lexicon, Anarchism was depoliticized and removed from any political legitimacy. The reckless and excessive violence that the British public characterized with Anarchism indicated to Britons that Anarchism was not
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a valid political doctrine; it was perceived as too destructive and too irrational to have any rational or constructive purpose, despite Anarchism’s highly rational and intellectual founders. As a result, Anarchism’s adherents were also dismissed, and Anarchism lost its political affiliation. Instead, the English populace perceived Anarchism as a disease that was afflicting civilized nations. Scientists and experts from across Europe theorized on this topic, and Anarchists were labeled as biologically abnormal, amoral and debased people who possessed a wanton and blood-thirsty urge for chaos and destruction. The British public concluded that Anarchists attempted to conceal this biologically criminal compulsion for destruction and bloodlust behind the guise of political justice.

Consequently, Anarchism became intermingled with the anxieties of the time, such as immigration, national degeneration, and nationalist rivalries. Immigration, declining social conditions, and the stability of the nation became reinvented in the light of the ambiguous Anarchist threat. Immigration transitioned from its beginnings as a benevolent act that provided sanctuary to the repressed and deprived of Europe to an alien invasion of disease, Anarchism and crime that threatened to destroy the nation. After the First Russian Revolution, Russians were perceived as particularly dangerous and ruthless Anarchists, and the large numbers of Russian and Eastern European immigrants pouring into England around 1900 intensified England’s fear of immigrants. In the wake of these burgeoning fears, the British public instigated a widespread outcry for immigration reform, which strengthened as the outrages of Tottenham and Sydney Street increasingly convinced the British public that the flood of immigrants was endangering and degrading the British nation.

To further heighten fears of immigrants, immigrants were also perceived to worsen the social conditions in poor urban neighborhoods at a time when England was already fearful of the
deplorable living and working conditions spreading across England’s urban slums. Britons feared that this decay would transform England into a foreign land and would so enrage the poor workers who resided in these boroughs that they would turn to Anarchism and violence against the Government for ignoring their plight and allowing such practices to occur. As deteriorating social conditions in urban centers evolved to represent the pollution of the nation by immigrants and the creation of Anarchist sympathizers within the nation, the upper- and middle-classes were no longer willing to remain removed from the problems of the poor and the unemployed. The perils of Anarchism and England’s social problems were increasingly seen as signs that the nation was crumbling, and the British public looked to the Government to halt the decline.

Edwardian England was also a time of shifting international power and simmering nationalist rivalries, and the British public feared that the might of the British Empire was in doubt. The State’s inability to subdue and regulate Anarchism intensified these pre-existing concerns. To many English citizens, the British Government’s failure to control Anarchism indicated that the State was in danger. They perceived that England’s war with Anarchists represented England’s ability to roust foreign aggressors, and they feared that the State’s difficulty or unwillingness to address the Anarchist menace was evidence that England was ill-prepared for the tactics and mentality of war in the modern age. Ultimately, many British citizens understood the State’s lack of control over Anarchists at home to mean that England would struggle in the event of a foreign war.

The fear of Anarchism urged the British public to reform the policies and the Government responsible for the Anarchist threat. The public blamed traditional nineteenth century liberalism and England’s sanctity toward individual freedoms for granting Anarchists admission into England and for allowing Anarchist rhetoric and violence to spread. Thus, the
British public perceived liberalism as old fashioned and unsafe. In its place the public sought to institute a stricter and more interventionist Government that monitored, controlled and curbed Anarchism and all of those practices that propagated Anarchism. In this scenario, individual liberties became increasingly viewed as old-fashioned ideals that were no longer suited to the dangers of the modern world, and, in turn, individual freedoms morphed into unmitigated risks that jeopardized the welfare of the nation. The public fervor over the dangers of Anarchism stirred Britons into forsaking individual rights in favor of England’s safety, advocating the greater good of the group over that of the individual.

Despite the Government’s recalcitrance to embrace many of the social and political changes advocated by the British public in the immediate aftermath of England’s Anarchist outrages, these crimes fundamentally changed the British people’s conception of safety and the State. No longer were the people of England content with the liberal politics of the previous century. Instead Britons were prepared for a change; they were prepared to welcome a State with stricter laws and more involvement from its governing bodies. Although the Anarchist movement itself in Britain was very small and seemingly insignificant, the widespread fear and sense of peril Anarchism created irrevocably changed how the British public saw the modern world and paved the way for the widespread support of the social and political changes that were soon to arrive with the dawn of World War I.

B. A NEW OUTLOOK ON EDWARDIAN ENGLAND

The adoption of a new safe State concept by the British public in 1911 was not the tangible change that identified the Government’s construction of a new State during and after
World War I, but the danger the British public perceived in Anarchism fundamentally changed the way the English people viewed England and the Government. The increasingly interventionist and paternalistic State adopted during the World Wars reflected this pre-existing change in public opinion and explained the British people’s easy acceptance of such seemingly drastic paternalistic changes. After all, the public had begun clamoring for these changes fifteen years earlier. Rather than the State initiating the nation’s shift towards the paternalistic Government of the twentieth century, the British people initiated the transition towards a more interventionist State at the turn of the century as they responded to the sensationalized press coverage exclaiming the dangers of Anarchism.

Britain faced enormous social, economic and political changes at the turn of the century. The dominant view bequeathed from George Dangerfield in the 1930’s contended that England’s political culture fractured under the resulting stress of social unrest and political feuds. However, as this paper has demonstrated, periods of intense crisis did not necessarily indicate political decay; rather, crisis formed the groundwork for nationalism and unity. In the example described here, national unity arose in response to the fears unleashed by the Anarchist outrages of 1892-1911. These crimes led the British public to perceive a new threat, one lurking hidden in the midst of Edwardian England – Anarchism.

The awareness of Anarchists precipitated a fear for public safety; the public became convinced that these individuals threatened to contaminate the nation and degenerate the British race. Thus, the desire for public safety and fears for British civilization caused the British public
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to frame pre-existing social and political problems within their understanding of Anarchism. In turn, such problems became matters of national security rather than petty differences in political ideology or personal irresponsibility. For example, poverty became a source of Anarchists; politics became a mechanism to control Anarchists, and immigration became the international circulation of Anarchists. Rather than indicating a period of disintegration, crises, such as those epitomized by the Anarchist outrages, provided Edwardian Britain with a strong consensus and motivation for state building and social reform. The Edwardian period, then, was not a peculiar gap between the epochs of Victorian liberalism and post-war interventionism but was rather a crucial period of transformation when the political culture in England actively sought to reform itself in the name of safety.

C. ANARCHISTS: A CONTINUED LEGACY OF TERROR

During the past decade the threat of Islamic extremism has reinvigorated the study of terrorism. Many of these studies, both popular and academic, have examined the historical roots of terrorism for lessons on present concerns. Following the London bombings of 7 July 2005, the Economist dedicated several feature articles to the history of terrorist violence. One article was entitled simply yet provocatively, “For jihadist, read anarchist.” The article implied that the Anarchist terrorism of the late nineteenth century could be utilized to understand, and even to define, more recent manifestations: “Bombs, beards, and backpacks: these are the distinguishing

510 See, for example, “For jihadist, read anarchist” and “Terrorism, Lessons from Anarchy” in Economist, 18 August 2005.
marks, at least in the popular imagination, of the terror-mongers who either incite or carry out the explosions that periodically rock the cities of the Western world. A century or so ago it was not so different: bombs, beards, and fizzing fuses.” The article noted how, akin to today, terrorism in the late nineteenth century gave rise to public panic and periodic government “crackdowns.”

Analogies of this sort are now entirely common and routinely appear in more scholarly publications. Both Walter Laqueur’s *The Age of Terrorism* and more recently John Merriman’s *The Dynamite Club* suggested that the origins of modern terrorism lie in the political and cultural ferment of *fin-de-siècle* Europe. The Anarchist attacks of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries do indeed share many similarities with recent events. They were acts of violence directed against governments and civilians, and they often occurred in prominent public places. They also generated a widespread sense of moral outrage among the public at large, who clamored for decisive action. Above all perhaps, they were characterized by extensive media coverage, as well as intense media speculation regarding the identity of the terrorists and the possibility of future plots.

Recent threats of Islamic terrorism have returned the Anarchist outrages of a century ago to the public spotlight. The similarities with today are indeed remarkable, especially in the case of tabloid papers, such as the *Daily Express* and the *Daily Mail*, whose alarmist rhetoric regarding dangerous immigrant individuals continues to be just as intense – and often as factually inaccurate – as it was in the Edwardian period. It is also remarkable that turn of the century criticisms were of an all too liberal state, which needed to implement tougher measures

---

513 For similar modern-day sensationalist rhetoric in the British Press towards immigrants, see “Immigration has left us without enough homes, so now politicians are telling the elderly to give up theirs” in *Daily Mail*, 20 October 2011; and “Mass immigration, and how Labour tried to destroy Britishness” in *Daily Mail*, 22 February 2012.
to counter a domestic, yet foreign, threat to the British way of life. Such criticisms are still made today, as are some of the solutions: arming police officers and deporting dangerous immigrants, for example.\textsuperscript{514}

Even so, Anarchist terrorism has its own peculiar cultural dynamics. The similarities with today are readily apparent, yet it is also true that whatever points of commonality might be identified, public panic, media speculation and so on, they coalesce and interweave in ways which are historically specific, reflecting anxieties, concerns and idioms specific to a particular time and place. This dissertation has provided an in depth study of the English Anarchist outrages which took place from 1892 to 1911. A striking aspect of these events was the way the popular press sought to describe and make sense of these outrages in terms of the anxieties and concerns peculiar to Edwardian England and, in particular, Edwardian London and its populous East End. In these outrages, Jews, rather than Muslims, were the object of suspicion, and Anarchism rather than radical Islamism was the suspect political creed. While we find similarities between the Anarchist attacks of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and the Islamic terrorist attacks of today, we also find differences, and these differences are just as significant and intriguing as their similarities.

LIST OF REFERENCES
A. ARCHIVES

The Bishopsgate Institute
The British Library
The British Library Newspaper Library
The Freedom Press Bookstore
The Institute for Historical Research Library
The Kate Sharpley Library
The National Archives (UK)
  Records of the Cabinet Office
  Records of the Director of Public Prosecutions
  Records of the Foreign Office
  Records of the Home Office
  Records of the Metropolitan Police
  Records of the Security Service
  Records of the War Office
The University of Manchester
The University of Mississippi

B. NEWSPAPERS & PERIODICALS

Aberdeen Journal
Aberdeen Weekly Journal
After Work
Anarchist (Sheffield)
The Birmingham Daily Argus
Birmingham Daily Post
Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine
Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine
The Brief: A Legal Review of Reviews
The Bristol Mercury and Daily Post
The British Quarterly Review
Commonweal
Contemporary Review
The Daily Chronicle
Daily Express
The Daily Graphic
Daily Mail
The Daily Mirror
The Daily News
Daily Standard
The Daily Telegraph
Der Freiheit
Economist
English Illustrated
English Illustrated Magazine
The Evening Standard
Figaro
The Fishing Gazette
Fortnightly
The Fortnightly Review
FUN
The Globe
The Graphic
The Guardian
The Halfpenny Marvel
Hansards
Illustrated Chips
Illustrated London News
The Illustrated Police News, etc.
Jackson’s Oxford Journal
Jewish Chronicle
The Lancet
Le Révolté
Leeds Mercury
The Liberty Review: Property Owners’ Guardian and Free Labour Advocate
The Liverpool Mercury, etc.
Lloyd’s Weekly News
Lloyd’s Weekly News
Lloyd’s Weekly Newspaper
Macmillan’s Magazine
The Manchester Times
The Monthly Review
The Morning Chronicle
The Morning Post
The National Observer
News of the World
The New York Times
The Newcastle Weekly Courant
The Nineteenth Century and After: A Monthly Review
The Northern Echo
The Observer
The Outlook
C. BOOKS & SCHOLARLY ARTICLES:


---------, *L'uomo Delinquente.* Torino: Fratelli Bocca, 1876.


Powell’s David *The Edwardian Crisis, 1901-1914* (1996)


Tamburini F. “Michele Angiolillo el Anarquista que Asesinó a Cánovas del Castillo.” In *Historia* 16, 1997.


Teaching Assistant, Department of History, University of Mississippi, 2004-2006.

M.A., History, University of Mississippi, 2005.

University of Mississippi Graduate Achievement Award, 2006-2007.

Graduate Instructor, Department of History, University of Mississippi, 2007-2012.

University of Mississippi Graduate Fellowship, 2007.


University of Mississippi Graduate Achievement Award, 2009-2010.

University of Mississippi Graduate Fellowship, 2012.

Instructor, Department of Public Service and Social Science, Massasoit Community College, 2012-Current.