Senator Joseph McCarthy Launches a "Final, All-Out Battle"
Against Communist Sympathizers in the United States

Senator Margaret Chase Smith Warns Against Those Who Use "Fear, Ignorance, Bigotry, and Smear [Tactics]" for Political Gain.

In August 1948 a magazine editor named Whittaker Chambers accused Alger Hiss, a former high-level U.S. State Department official, of spying for the Soviet Union. (Hiss emphatically denied the charges and, after being vilified by a young congressman named Richard M. Nixon, became a hero to the left.) In September 1949 the Soviets tested their first atomic bomb, bringing a sudden end to America's four-year nuclear monopoly. And in October 1949 the world's most populated country, China, declared itself a communist nation. Event after event fueled the fires of anti-communism in America until, by the beginning of the 1950s, it had become a blaze of fear and suspicion. Few politicians capitalized on this anxiety more effectively than a little-known Republican senator from Wisconsin named Joseph McCarthy. McCarthy's most infamous statement came during an address to a women's group in Wheeling, West Virginia, where he announced that he had in his possession a list of 205-later he would claim the number was only 57—names of communist subversives in the U.S. government (he never released the list). The speech, which was given on February 9, 1950, was ostensibly to honor the memory of Abraham Lincoln. But this was merely a pretext for a series of accusations that would launch one of the darkest periods in twentiethcentury American politics.

Today we are engaged in a final, all-out battle between communistic atheism and Christianity. The modern champions of communism have selected this as the time. And, ladies and gentlemen, the chips are down. They are truly down.

Lest there be any doubt that the time has been chosen, let us go directly to the leader of communism today, Joseph Stalin. Here is what he said, not back in 1928, not before the war, not during the war, but two years after the last war was ended: "To think that the communist revolution can be carried out peacefully, within the framework of a Christian democracy, means one has either gone out of one's mind and lost all normal understanding, or has grossly and openly repudiated the communist revolution."

Ladies and gentlemen, can there be anyone here tonight who is so blind as to say that the war is not on? Can there be anyone who fails to realize that the communist world has said, "The time is now," that this is the time for the showdown between the democratic Christian world and the communist atheistic world?

Unless we face this fact, we shall pay the price that must be paid by those who wait too long.

Six years ago, at the time of the first conference to map out the peace—Dumbarton Oaks—there was within the Soviet orbit 180 million people. Lined up on the anti-totalitarian side there were in the world at that time roughly 1.625 billion people. Today, only six years later, there are 800 million people under the absolute domination of Soviet Russia, an increase of over 400 percent. On our side, the figure has shrunk to around 500 million. In other words, in less than six years the odds have changed from 9 to 1 in our favor to 8 to 5 against us. This indicates the swiftness of the tempo of communist victories and American defeats in the Cold War. As one of our outstanding historical figures once said, "When a great democracy is destroyed, it will not be because of enemies from without, but rather because of enemies from within."

The truth of this statement is becoming terrifyingly clear as we see this country each day losing on every front.

At war's end we were physically the strongest nation on earth and, at least potentially, the most powerful intellectually and morally. Ours could have been the honor of being a beacon in the desert of destruction, a shining living proof that civilization was not yet ready to destroy itself. Unfortunately, we have failed miserably and tragically to rise to that opportunity.

The reason why we find ourselves in a position of impotency is not because our only powerful potential enemy has sent men to invade our shores, but rather because of the traitorous actions of those who have been treated so well by this nation. It has not been the less fortunate or members of minority groups who have been selling this nation out, but rather those who have had all the benefits that the wealthiest nation on earth has had to offer—the finest homes, the finest college education, and the finest jobs in government we can give.

This is glaringly true in the State Department. There the bright young men who are born with silver spoons in their mouths are the ones who have been worst. . . . In my opinion the State Department, which is one of the most important government departments, is thoroughly infested with communists.

I have here in my hand a list of 205—a list of names that were made known to the secretary of state as being members of the Communist Party and who nevertheless are still working and shaping policy in the State Department.

One thing to remember in discussing the communists in our government is that we are not dealing with spies who get thirty pieces of silver to steal the blueprints of a new weapon. We are dealing with a far more sinister type of activity because it permits the enemy to guide and shape our policy. . . .

ind the hov fres

nec

thei the was side tary

Jadio tion tion mor of h

moi

whice subjections mass the coather

exist

ther to a : of all great tion refer the h pants Chris sacrec natio:

peace—people. at time million of over lion. In in our of comur outstroyed, of ene-

see this

at least ld have ing livmately,

not beshores, ated so minorto have r—the mment

young to have of the i com-

: made t Party te De-

overnf silver re sinpe our This brings us to the case of one Alger Hiss, who is important not as an individual anymore, but rather because he is so representative of a group in the State Department. It is unnecessary to go over the sordid events showing how he sold out the nation which had given him so much. Those are rather fresh in all of our minds.

However, it should be remembered that the facts in regard to his connection with this international communist spy ring were made known to the then Under Secretary of State Berle three days after Hitler and Stalin signed the Russo-German alliance pact. At that time one Whittaker Chambers, who was also part of the spy ring, apparently decided that with Russia on Hitler's side, he could no longer betray our nation to Russia. He gave Under Secretary of State Berle—and this is all a matter of record—practically all, if not more, of the facts upon which Hiss's conviction was based. . . .

As you hear this story of high treason, I know that you are saying to yourself, "Well, why doesn't the Congress do something about it?" Actually, ladies and gentlemen, one of the important reasons for the graft, the corruption, the dishonesty, the disloyalty, the treason in high government positions—one of the most important reasons why this continues is a lack of moral uprising on the part of the 140 million American people. In the light of history, however, this is not hard to explain.

It is the result of an emotional hangover and a temporary moral lapse which follows every war. It is the apathy to evil which people who have been subjected to the tremendous evils of war feel. As the people of the world see mass murder, the destruction of defenseless and innocent people, and all of the crime and lack of morals which go with war, they become numb and apathetic. It has always been thus after war.

However, the morals of our people have not been destroyed. They still exist. This cloak of numbness and apathy has only needed a spark to rekindle them. Happily, this spark has finally been supplied.

As you know, very recently the secretary of state proclaimed his loyalty to a man guilty of what has always been considered as the most abominable of all crimes—of being a traitor to the people who gave him a position of great trust. The secretary of state, in attempting to justify his continued devotion to the man who sold out the Christian world to the atheistic world, referred to Christ's Sermon on the Mount as a justification and reason therefore, and the reaction of the American people to this would have made the heart of Abraham Lincoln happy. When this pompous diplomat in striped pants, with a phony British accent, proclaimed to the American people that Christ on the Mount endorsed communism, high treason, and betrayal of a sacred trust, the blasphemy was so great that it awakened the dormant indignation of the American people.

He has lighted the spark which is resulting in a moral uprising and will end only when the whole sorry mess of twisted, warped thinkers are swept from the national scene so that we may have a new birth of national honesty and decency in government.

The allegations shocked the country and elevated McCarthy to a position of enormous power and prestige. Few dared to challenge him lest they too be labeled communist sympathizers. But one representative—America's only female senator, in fact—Margaret Chase Smith, stood before her colleagues on June 1, 1950, and requested a "declaration of conscience" affirming the principles on which the Constitution was founded and castigating those who sullied them through "irresponsible sensationalism."

Mr. President, I would like to speak briefly and simply about a serious national condition. It is a national feeling of fear and frustration that could result in national suicide and the end of everything that we Americans hold dear. It is a condition that comes from the lack of effective leadership either in the legislative branch or the executive branch of our government. . . .

Mr. President, I speak as a Republican. I speak as a woman. I speak as a United States senator. I speak as an American.

The United States Senate has long enjoyed worldwide respect as the greatest deliberative body in the world. But recently that deliberative character has too often been debased to the level of a forum of hate and character assassination sheltered by the shield of congressional immunity.

It is ironical that we senators can in debate in the Senate, directly or indirectly, by any form of words, impute to any American who is not a senator any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming an American—and without that non-senator American having any legal redress against us—yet if we say the same thing in the Senate about our colleagues, we can be stopped on the grounds of being out of order. . . .

I think that it is high time for the United States Senate and its members to do some real soul searching and to weigh our consciences as to the manner in which we are performing our duty to the people of America and the manner in which we are using or abusing our individual powers and privileges. I think that it is high time that we remembered that we have sworn to uphold and defend the Constitution. I think that it is high time that we remembered that the Constitution, as amended, speaks not only of the freedom of speech but also of trial by jury instead of trial by accusation. Whether it be a criminal prosecution in court or a character prosecution in the Senate, there is little practical distinction when the life of a person has been ruined.

Those of us who shout the loudest about Americanism in making character assassinations are all too frequently those who, by our own words and

acts, ignocize, the depende America in dange know so; none of have set:

The minds les ponents. so abusec

The smeared a cases—su case—to somethin

As a I Republic: which it : met that a united nat spending;

Today the suspici ous tentac a Democr and loose again has t

The rewith suffic smears. An cause the l leadership.

The nather Reput Calumny—Party could uphold any interest. Su want to see

g and will are swept al honesty

of enormous communist fact—Marited a "decvas founded m."

erious nacould recans hold hip either it.... speak as a

ect as the charac-

tly or ina senator nd with--yet if we opped on

members the mani and the nd privisworn to it we refreedom ther it be ate, there
id.
ing charords and

acts, ignore some of the basic principles of Americanism: the right to criticize, the right to hold unpopular beliefs, the right to protest, the right of independent thought. The exercise of these rights should not cost one single American citizen his reputation or his right to a livelihood, nor should he be in danger of losing his reputation or livelihood merely because he happens to know someone who holds unpopular beliefs. Who of us does not? Otherwise none of us could call our souls our own. Otherwise thought control would have set in.

The American people are sick and tired of being afraid to speak their minds lest they be politically smeared as communists or fascists by their opponents. Freedom of speech is not what it used to be in America. It has been so abused by some that it is not exercised by others.

The American people are sick and tired of seeing innocent people smeared and guilty people whitewashed. But there have been enough proved cases—such as the Amerasia case, the Hiss case, the Coplon case, the Gold case—to cause nationwide distrust and strong suspicion that there may be something to the unproved, sensational accusations.

As a Republican, I say to my colleagues on this side of the aisle that the Republican Party faces a challenge today that is not unlike the challenge which it faced back in Lincoln's day. The Republican Party so successfully met that challenge that it emerged from the Civil War as the champion of a united nation, in addition to being a party which unrelentingly fought loose spending and loose programs.

Today our country is being psychologically divided by the confusion and the suspicions that are bred in the United States Senate to spread like cancerous tentacles of "know nothing, suspect everything" attitudes. Today we have a Democratic administration that has developed a mania for loose spending and loose programs. History is repeating itself, and the Republican Party again has the opportunity to emerge as the champion of unity and prudence.

The record of the present Democratic administration has provided us with sufficient campaign issues without the necessity of resorting to political smears. America is rapidly losing its position as leader of the world simply because the Democratic administration has pitifully failed to provide effective leadership. . . .

The nation sorely needs a Republican victory. But I do not want to see the Republican Party ride to political victory on the Four Horsemen of Calumny—Fear, Ignorance, Bigotry, and Smear. I doubt if the Republican Party could do so, simply because I do not believe the American people will uphold any political party that puts political exploitation above the national interest. Surely we Republicans are not that desperate for victory. I do not want to see the Republican Party win that way. While it might be a fleeting

victory for the Republican Party, it would be a more lasting defeat for the American people. Surely it would ultimately be suicide for the Republican Party and the two-party system that has protected our American liberties from the dictatorship of a one-party system.

As members of the minority party, we do not have the primary authority to formulate the policy of our government. But we do have the responsibility of rendering constructive criticism, of clarifying issues, of allaying fears by acting as responsible citizens. As a woman, I wonder how the mothers, wives, sisters, and daughters feel about the way in which members of their families have been politically mangled in Senate debate—and I use the word debate advisedly. As a United States senator, I am not proud of the way in which the Senate has been made a publicity platform for irresponsible sensationalism. I am not proud of the reckless abandon in which unproved charges have been hurled from this side of the aisle. I am not proud of the obviously staged, undignified countercharges which have been attempted in retaliation from the other side of the aisle. . . .

As an American, I am shocked at the way Republicans and Democrats alike are playing directly into the communist design of "confuse, divide, and conquer." As an American, I do not want a Democratic administration whitewash or cover-up any more than I want a Republican smear or witch hunt.

As an American, I condemn a Republican fascist just as much as I condemn a Democrat communist. I condemn a Democrat fascist just as much as I condemn a Republican communist. They are equally dangerous to you and me and to our country. As an American, I want to see our nation recapture the strength and unity it once had when we fought the enemy instead of ourselves.

As the nation's anxieties over Communism heightened, particularly after the 1950 invasion of South Korea by North Korea's communist troops and the 1951 trial and eventual execution of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, whom the American left defended (like Alger Hiss), McCarthy's popularity and influence surged. In 1953 he was made chairman of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which bullied Americans, both famous and unknown, into answering a series of hostile questions, including: "Are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?" Many who testified before the committee saw their careers destroyed (some even committed suicide as a result), and those who refused to appear were blacklisted and imprisoned. McCarthy finally met his match in Joseph Welch, chief counsel for the U.S. Army, who excoriated the senator as a man with "no sense of decency." A television broadcast by the esteemed newsman Edward R. Murrow on McCarthy and his tactics proved damning as well. McCarthy's reputation plunged in the months to come, and the Senate censured him in December 1954. Decades after McCarthy's death from alcohol-related illnesses in

1957, the collap cused Alger Hi: to scholars, con Carthy later re kicking commu his fellow artis mittee], ignorir actor, comment

## Nobel Laure

When William erature, the mobut regretted hen. "I doubt year-old autho Nobel commits public, Faulknence. He ultimheavily the nig livered what he

I feel that thi work in the all for profit, which did no difficult to fit purpose and the acclaim, listened to by guish and tra where I am s

Our trag tained by no spirit. There the young m human heart cause only th for the ablican berties

uthorsponsiig fears others, of their e word way in sensasharges viously

iliation

nocrats de, and white-1 hunt. I connuch as ou and capture tead of

1950 inrial and
lefended
as made
vericans,
ng: "Are
who tesvicide as
cCarthy
coriated
steemed
as well.
red him
vesses in

1957, the collapse of the Soviet Union would exonerate those, like McCarthy, who accused Alger Hiss and Julius Rosenberg of being spies. Soviet intelligence files, now open to scholars, confirmed their guilt as communist agents. But even those who aided McCarthy later recognized there was no excuse for his scorched-earth policy. "I was all for kicking communists out of Hollywood," confessed a famous actor who had informed on his fellow artists in the 1950s for the FBI, "but some members of [McCarthy's committee], ignoring standards of truth and fair play, ganged up on innocent people." The actor, commenting in 1990, was Ronald Reagan.

## Nobel Laureate William Faulkner Expresses His Heartfelt Belief That "Man Will Not Merely Endure: He Will Prevail."

When William Faulkner first received word that he had won the Nobel Prize for literature, the most prestigious literary award in the world, he gratefully accepted the prize but regretted he would not be able to attend the official ceremony in Stockholm, Sweden. "I doubt if I know anything worth talking two minutes about," the fifty-three-year-old author of The Sound and the Fury and As I Lay Dying explained to the Nobel committee. More likely, though, as a man who was uncomfortable speaking in public, Faulkner was anxious about addressing such a large and distinguished audience. He ultimately did go to Stockholm and, in an effort to settle his nerves, drank heavily the night before. On December 10, 1950, Faulkner, haggard and hungover, delivered what has been hailed as one of the finest Nobel acceptance speeches ever given.

I feel that this award was not made to me as a man, but to my work—a life's work in the agony and sweat of the human spirit, not for glory and least of all for profit, but to create out of the materials of the human spirit something which did not exist before. So this award is only mine in trust. It will not be difficult to find a dedication for the money part of it commensurate with the purpose and significance of its origin. But I would like to do the same with the acclaim, too, by using this moment as a pinnacle from which I might be listened to by the young men and women already dedicated to the same anguish and travail, among whom is already that one who will some day stand where I am standing.

Our tragedy today is a general and universal physical fear so long sustained by now that we can even bear it. There are no longer problems of the spirit. There is only the question: When will I be blown up? Because of this, the young man or woman writing today has forgotten the problems of the human heart in conflict with itself which alone can make good writing because only that is worth writing about, worth the agony and the sweat.