



# The Rise and Fall of Joseph McCarthy

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

## Activity #1: McCarthy’s Accusations

**Directions:** Read the documents below. As you read, answer the following questions:

Question	Answer
What information did McCarthy cite to show that America was losing the war against Communism?	
Explain what McCarthy meant when he said “When a great democracy is destroyed, it will not be from enemies from without, but rather because of enemies from within.”	
How did McCarthy describe the sorts of people engaged in “traitorous actions” in the United States?	
What did Truman mean when he claimed that McCarthy was an “asset” to the Kremlin?	
According to Truman, how did McCarthy fit in with the overall strategy of the Republican Party?	
Evaluate the five statements by the Republican senators. What was their purpose in issuing these statements?	

In your opinion, how did partisanship fighting between the Republicans and Democrats interfere with the issue at hand?	
How does the political cartoon by Herblock portray McCarthy? Why do you think he chose to portray McCarthy this way?	

[You do not cite this excerpt in the lesson materials—see other file.]

Excerpts from Speech of Joseph McCarthy, Wheeling, West Virginia, February 9, 1950:  
<http://historymatters.gmu.edu/d/6456>

[...] 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....

Six years ago...there was within the Soviet orbit, 180,000,000 people. Lined up on the antitotalitarian side there were in the world at that time, roughly 1,625,000,000 people. Today, only six years later, there are 80,000,000,000 people under the absolute domination of Soviet Russia—an increase of over 400 percent. On our side, the figure has shrunk to around 500,000. In other words, in less than six years, the odds have changed from 9 to 1 in our favor to 8 to 1 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 from enemies from without, but rather because of enemies from within.” [...]

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 traitorous to this Nation, 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 most traitorous...

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....

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—being a traitor to the people who gave him a position of great trust—high treason....

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 honesty and decency in government.

Excerpt from President Truman's News Conference at Key West, March 30, 1950:

<http://historymatters.gmu.edu/d/6456>

Q. Do you think that Senator McCarthy can show any disloyalty exists in the State Department?

The President. I think the greatest asset that the Kremlin has is Senator McCarthy....

Q. Mr. President, could we quote that one phrase, "I think the greatest asset the Kremlin has is Senator McCarthy"?

The President. Now let me give you a little preliminary, and then I will tell you what I think you ought to do. Let me tell you what the situation is.

We started out in 1945, when I became President, and the two wars were still going on, and the Russians were our allies, just the same as the British and the French and Brazil and the South American countries. And we won the war together....

Then our objective was to—as quickly as possible—get peace in the world. We made certain agreements with the Russians and the British and the French and the Chinese. We kept those agreements to the letter. They have nearly all been—those agreements where the Russians were involved—been broken by the Russians. And it became perfectly evident that they had no intention of carrying out the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter and the agreements which had been made at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam. And it became evident that there was an endeavor on the part of the Kremlin to control the world.

A procedure was instituted which came to be known as the cold war. The airlift to Berlin was only one phase of it. People became alarmed here in the United States then, that there might be people whose sympathies were with the Communist ideal of government—which is not communism under any circumstances, it is totalitarianism of the worst brand. There isn't any difference between the totalitarian Russian Government and the Hitler government and the Franco government in Spain. They are all alike. They are police state governments.

In 1947 I instituted a loyalty program for Government employees, and that loyalty procedure program was set up in such a way that the rights of individuals were respected.

In a survey of the 2,200,000 employees at that time, I think there were some 205—something like that—who left the service. I don't know—a great many of them left of their own accord....

And then, for political background, the Republicans have been trying vainly to find an issue on which to make a bid for the control of the Congress for next year. They tried "statism." They tried "welfare state." They tried "socialism." And there are a certain number of members of the Republican Party who are trying to dig up that old malodorous dead horse called "isolationism." And in order to do that, they are perfectly willing to sabotage the bipartisan foreign policy of the United States. And this fiasco which has been going on in the Senate is the very best asset that the Kremlin could have in the operation of the

cold war. And that is what I mean when I say that McCarthy's antics are the best asset that the Kremlin can have.

Now, if anybody really felt that there were disloyal people in the employ of the Government, the proper and the honorable way to handle the situation would be to come to the President of the United States and say, "This man is a disloyal person. He is in such and such a department." We will investigate him immediately, and if he were a disloyal person he would be immediately fired.

That is not what they want. They are trying to create an issue, and it is going to be just as big a fiasco as the campaign in New York and other places on these other false and fatuous issues.

With a little bit of intelligence they could find an issue at home without a bit of trouble!

Q. What would it be, Mr. President?

The President. Anything in the domestic line. I will meet them on any subject they want, but to try to sabotage the foreign policy of the United States, in the face of the situation with which we are faced, is just as bad as trying to cut the Army in time of war.

Statement of Seven Republican Senators, June 1, 1950: <http://historymatters.gmu.edu/d/6459>

1. We are Republicans. But we are Americans first. It is as Americans that we express our concern with the growing confusion that threatens the security and stability of our country. Democrats and Republicans alike have contributed to that confusion.
2. The Democratic administration has initially created the confusion by its lack of effective leadership, by its contradictory grave warnings and optimistic assurances, by its complacency to the threat of communism here at home, by its oversensitiveness to rightful criticism, by its petty bitterness against its critics.
3. Certain elements of the Republican Party have materially added to this confusion in the hopes of riding the Republican party to victory through the selfish political exploitation of fear, bigotry, ignorance, and intolerance. There are enough mistakes of the Democrats for Republicans to criticize constructively without resorting to political smears.
4. To this extent, Democrats and Republicans alike have unwittingly, but undeniably, played directly into the Communist design of "confuse, divide and conquer."
5. It is high time that we stopped thinking politically as Republicans and Democrats about elections and started thinking patriotically as Americans about national security based on individual freedom. It is high time that we all stopped being tools and victims of totalitarian techniques—techniques that, if continued here unchecked, will surely end what we have come to cherish as the American way of life.

"I Have Here in my Hand..." (cartoon): <http://www.loc.gov/rr/print/swann/herblock/images/s03479u.jpg>



## The Rise and Fall of Joseph McCarthy

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

### Activity #2: Eisenhower and McCarthy

Your teacher will divide the class into two groups. Using the documents that follow, your group will either defend or oppose the following proposition:

“President Eisenhower should have spoken out against McCarthy earlier than he did.”

“You Mean I’m Supposed to Stand on That?”

<http://www.loc.gov/rr/print/swann/herblock/images/hblock4.jpg>

“Nothing Exceeds Like Excess”: <http://www.loc.gov/rr/print/swann/herblock/images/s03493u.jpg>

“Have a Care, Sir”: <http://www.loc.gov/rr/print/swann/herblock/images/hblock5.jpg>

Excerpt from draft of Eisenhower speech given on October 3, 1952 in Milwaukee, Wisconsin on "Communism and Freedom":

<http://www.eisenhower.utexas.edu/dl/McCarthy/sixthdraftDDEWicampaignspeech.pdf>

[NOTE: The underlined section, dealing with George C. Marshall was deleted from the speech. McCarthy had suggested that Marshall, Eisenhower’s superior during World War II and later Truman’s secretary of state, was a Soviet agent.]

To defend freedom...is—first of all—to respect freedom. That respect demands another, quite simple kind of respect—respect for the integrity of fellow citizens who enjoy their right to disagree. The right to challenge a man’s judgment carries with it no automatic right to question his honor.

Here I have a case in mind. Charges of disloyalty have in the past been leveled against General George C. Marshall. I am not now discussing any errors in judgment he may have made while serving in capacities other than military [in other words, as Secretary of State]. But I was privileged throughout the years of World War II to know General Marshall personally, as Chief of Staff of the Army. I know him, as a man and a soldier, to be dedicated with singular selflessness and the profoundest patriotism to the service of America.

Armed with a clear and uncompromising respect for freedom, how then shall we defend it? [...]

Excerpt from a letter from President Eisenhower to his friend, Harry Bullis, May 18, 1953:  
<http://www.eisenhower.archives.gov/dl/McCarthy/DDEtoBullis51853pg1.pdf>

[...] With respect to McCarthy, I continue to believe that the President of the United States cannot afford to name names in opposing procedures, practices and methods in our government. This applies with special force when the individual concerned enjoys the immunity of a United States Senator. This particular individual wants, above all else, publicity. Nothing would probably please him more than to get the publicity that would be generated by public repudiation by the President.

I do not mean that there is no possibility that I shall ever change my mind on this point. I merely mean that as of this moment, I consider that the wisest choice of action is to continue to pursue a steady, positive policy in foreign relations, in legal procedures in cleaning out the insecure and the disloyal, and in all other areas where McCarthy seems to take such a specific and personal interest...

It is a sorry mess; at times one feels almost like hanging his head in shame when he reads some of the unreasoned, vicious outbursts of demagoguery that appear in our public prints. But whether a Presidential “crack down” would better, or would actually worsen, the situation, is a moot question.

Excerpt from a letter from President Eisenhower to his brother, Milton Eisenhower, October 9, 1953:  
<http://www.eisenhower.archives.gov/dl/McCarthy/DDEtoMiltonreMcCarthy.pdf>

As for McCarthy. Only a short-sighted or completely inexperienced individual would urge the use of the office of the Presidency to give an opponent the publicity he so avidly desires. Time and time again, without apology or evasion, I—and many members of this Administration—have stood for the right of the individual, for free expression of convictions, even though those convictions might be unpopular, and for uncensored use of our libraries, except as dictated by common decency.

We have urged that America must be true to the principles of freedom and justice as applied to the individual if America herself is to remain free. Permit me to say that I think there would be far more progress made against so-called “McCarthy-ism” if individuals of an opposing purpose would take it upon themselves to help sustain and promote their own ideals, rather than to wait and wail for a blasting of their pet enemies by someone else....

Excerpts from notes from the day by C.D. Jackson, Speechwriter and Special Assistant to the President, November 27, 1953:  
<http://www.eisenhower.archives.gov/dl/McCarthy/CDJacksonNotesfromday112753pg1.pdf>

[...] Tuesday night McCarthy made sensational radio and television talk. My impression was aside from open season on lambasting Truman, that McCarthy had...attempted to establish McCarthyism as Republicanism, and anybody who didn't agree was either a fool or a protector of Communism.

Wonderful syllogism—I am the only effective rooter-outer of Communists; there are still Communists in Government; this Government headed by Eisenhower; therefore unless Eisenhower roots them out my way, he is a harbinger of Communists.

Wednesday, James Reston [a prominent newspaper columnist] phoned to talk about this, and I told him I knew nothing about it, as [the] Pres[ident was] out of town and I had had no discussions on the subject.

He asked me personally what I thought, and I replied that I thought McCarthy had declared war on the President.

Sent memorandum to [White House Chief of Staff] Sherman Adams to that effect, suggesting President be prepared with right question and answer for next press conference.

Excerpts from notes from the day by C.D. Jackson, Speechwriter and Special Assistant to the President, November 30, 1953:

<http://www.eisenhower.archives.gov/dl/McCarthy/CDJacksonnotesfromday113053pg1.pdf>

Staff meeting of White House staff called by [White House Press Secretary James] Hagerty.... Hagerty opened up by mentioning recent Reston, Folliard, and Harsch pieces [newspaper columns] each one of which contained anonymous attribution to White House personnel. He cautioned against talking, saying that it inevitably was embarrassing to the President, etc., etc....

After moment of dead silence, I said that I had told Reston on the telephone the item he had in quotes, namely, that McCarthy had declared war on the President—and that this gave me an opportunity to say some more on the subject.

I went into the matter completely, including going back to Campaign speech in Milwaukee when Marshall reference deleted. Warned them that this Three Little Monkeys [See No Evil, Hear No Evil, Speak No Evil] act was not working and would not work, and that appeasing McCarthy in order to save his 7 votes for this year's legislative program was poor tactics, poor strategy,...and poor arithmetic, and that unless the President stepped up to bat on this soon, the Republicans would have neither a program, nor [the upcoming midterm election in] 1954, nor [the presidential election in] 1956....

Also I made proposition that the President substitute television appearance Wednesday for his scheduled press conference and face up before the nation to this declaration of war. Was appalled to discover that it had been planned to cancel the press conference and have the President go to Bermuda having said nothing. Big rhubarb ["Big deal"]....

Excerpt from Memorandum, Stanley M. Rumbough, Jr. and Charles Masterson, Special Assistants in the White House, to Murray Snyder, Assistant White House Press Secretary, about responding to Senator McCarthy, December 1, 1953:

<http://www.eisenhower.archives.gov/dl/McCarthy/Rumbaughmemo12153pg1.pdf>

## I. MAIN POINTS FOR CONSIDERATION

- A. Senator McCarthy has attacked the President, and the President's prestige is threatened both in this country and abroad.
- B. Would a response by the President lend dignity and status to the attack?
- C. Will a response to McCarthy jeopardize the legislative program?

## II. SUPPLEMENTARY FACTS

A. Image of the President as an inspirational leader is important to the independent voter, who provided the margin of victory in the last election. These men and women did not vote for the Republican Party; they voted for Eisenhower. If their image of the President becomes clouded and if they do not vote again as they did in the last election, no amount of effort by the Republican Party will bring success.

B. The threat to the legislative program is highly questionable. There are qualified observers who say that McCarthy and his coterie will neither drag their feet nor vote with the Democrats in the event the President speaks out against McCarthyism. Furthermore, there is no assurance that appeasement now will insure the legislative program. It is apparent that Senator McCarthy acts exclusively in the interest of Senator McCarthy, and if he deems it good strategy to discredit Eisenhower by scuttling the legislative program he will do so, whether or not the President speaks out against McCarthyism.

C. People are swayed by emotion more than reason. And this is an emotional issue. Furthermore, the image of the president as a fighter may well be more important politically than the success or failure of a legislative program (assuming that success or failure of the program is involved).

D. One of the most dramatic moments in the President's career has arrived. He can appeal to the people now as a popular leader who has been attacked. Further, in speaking out against McCarthyism he is on the side of the angels. He can answer McCarthyism in the spirit of fair play and in the very words of the founding fathers, the Bill of Rights, Washington and Lincoln.

### III. SUGGESTED ACTION

A. Televising the press conference—on Thursday instead of Wednesday to allow more time for a build-up. This is a dramatic moment for the first televised press conference and can be explained partly on the basis of the N[ew] Y[ork] newspaper strike and partly on the need to match the coverage McCarthy had when he issued the challenge....

C. Start off the press conference with a statement including such concepts as:

This Administration is determined to keep the people informed. We have been charged on the one hand with harboring Communists and on the other hand with playing politics in our program of cleaning Communists out. The record of this Administration is open to public view—and it is a record we are and will be proud of.

As I have stated before, the era in which we live is dominated by the threat of world domination by the forces of Communism. If our way of life is to be preserved, we must be alert to that threat. Blindness or poor judgment in detecting Communist influence in our government is as dangerous as excesses in the other direction.

Speaking for that part of the Administration that is my responsibility, I can say that we shall not be guided by political motives in our fight against the Communist threat and we shall not be cajoled or challenged into abandoning the traditional American spirit of fair play. We shall be vigilant but not fanatical.

Excerpts from notes from the day by C.D. Jackson, Speechwriter and Special Assistant to the President, December 2, 1953: <http://www.eisenhower.archives.gov/dl/McCarthy/CDJacksonDec21953.pdf>

[...] Prexy [the President] read their current draft [of Eisenhower's proposed response to McCarthy] with visible irritation, and made some mumbling comments. Jack Martin [Administrative Assistant to the President] then pitched in with great courage and said that a vacuum existed in this country, and it was a political vacuum, and unless the President filled it somebody else would fill it. The President twisted and squirmed, but Martin stuck to his point. I pitched in as strongly as I could by telling him that so long as [Senator Robert A.] Taft [of Ohio, who had died earlier that year] was alive he [Eisenhower] might have been able to get out of the responsibility of leading the Party, but now he could no longer get out of it, and that people were waiting for a sign, and a simple sign—and now was the time.

Big hassle over text started. President read my text with great irritation, slammed it back at me and said he would not refer to McCarthy personally—"I will not get in the gutter with that guy."

But gradually an interesting thing developed. The needling and the goosing began to take effect, and the President himself began very ably to firm up the text as he re-read it again, this time very carefully.

Everyone's mood began to change from divided snarling into united helping him along, and when Prexy dictated the last paragraph exactly as it finally appeared, which contained the real Republican leadership gimmick, the group almost cheered.



## The Rise and Fall of Joseph McCarthy

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

### Activity #3: The Fall of Joseph McCarthy

**Directions (Group #1):** Read the following documents. After you have done so, write a paragraph explaining how the events described in them might have contributed to McCarthy’s downfall. Be prepared to share this paragraph with the class.

Excerpt from diary entry by James C. Hagerty, White House Press Secretary, February 25, 1954:  
<http://www.eisenhower.archives.gov/dl/McCarthy/DiaryTypedHagertyFeb2554.pdf>

[The following occurred after Robert Stevens, Eisenhower’s Secretary of the Army, was called to testify before McCarthy’s committee. McCarthy had begun suggesting that Communists had infiltrated important positions in the U.S. Army.]

[...] Pres[ident] very mad and getting fed up—it’s his Army and he doesn’t like McCarthy’s tactics at all. Stevens and [Deputy Secretary of Defense Roger M.] Kyes joined [Vice President Richard M.] Nixon and all of us at 4 P.M.—worked ‘til 5:30 on statement—cleared it with Pres who made it stronger and then released it in joint conference in my office.

Quotes—Ike on subject: “This guy McCarthy is going to get into trouble over this. I’m not going to take this one lying down”—“my friends tell me it won’t be long in this Army stuff before McCarthy starts using my name instead of Stevens. He’s ambitious. He wants to be President. He’s the last guy in the world who’ll ever get there, if I have anything to say.”

Excerpt from diary entry by James Hagerty, March 10, 1954:  
<http://www.eisenhower.archives.gov/dl/McCarthy/DiaryentryMarch1054.pdf>

[...] Good conference—Pres tough on Joe [McCarthy] and backed up [Vermont Senator Ralph] Flanders [an outspoken McCarthy critic].... Pres in fighting mood, has had it as far as Joe is concerned: “if he wants to get recognized anymore,” Pres told Persons, “only way he can do it is to stand up and publicly say ‘I was wrong in browbeating witnesses, wrong in saying the Army is coddling Communists, and wrong in my attack on Stevens. I apologize’—that’s the only way I ever welcome him back into fold.”

Excerpt from diary entry by James Hagerty, May 14, 1954:  
<http://www.eisenhower.archives.gov/dl/McCarthy/Diaryentry51454.pdf>

[...] We also discussed the Army-McCarthy hearings and [Arkansas Senator and member of McCarthy’s committee John L.] McClellan’s threat to subpoena White House staff members and bring them before

the Committee. The President said that he would not stand for this for one minute. He explained that he looked upon his staff members as confidential advisors and that the Congress had absolutely no right to ask them to testify in any way, shape or form about the advice that they were giving to him at any time on the subject—“If they want to make a test of this principle, I’ll fight them tooth and nail and up and down the country. It is a matter of principle with me and I will never permit it”—The President reiterated his belief that Stevens was dead right by refusing to permit the hearings to go into closed sessions and said that he would once again tell all members of his staff to keep out of this controversy, to have nothing to say on it, and to let my office, and my office alone, be the spokesman on all question dealing with McCarthy.

Excerpt from diary entry by James Hagerty, May 17, 1954:

<http://www.eisenhower.archives.gov/dl/McCarthy/Diaryentry51754pg1.pdf>

[...] Turning to his letter [that is, the order banning his advisors from testifying before Congress] the President announced that they all knew that he had been trying to stay out of the “damn business on the Hill”, [Capitol Hill; in other words, Congress] that many people have been begging him to get into the struggle, to attack McCarthy personally but that he had refused to do so. However, he said, a situation had come up in the threatened subpoena of his confidential advisers that made it necessary for him to act. He said that he had written a letter to the Secretary of Defense ordering him to refuse to permit their people to discuss confidential matters with the Committee and that he had also attached the Attorney General’s memorandum outlining the precedents taken by twelve of his predecessors.... “Any man who testifies as to the advice he gave me won’t be working for me that night”—“I will not allow people around me to be subpoenaed and you might just as well know it now.”

Excerpt from diary entry by Press Secretary James Hagerty, May 28, 1954:

<http://www.eisenhower.archives.gov/dl/McCarthy/Diaryentry52854pg1.pdf>

[...] Following staff meeting drafted statement designed for President to issue regarding McCarthy’s appeal at hearing yesterday to Federal employees to disregard Presidential orders and laws and report to him on “graft, corruption, Communism and treason.” Discussed the statement with the Attorney General and he was all in favor of us putting one out.... I gave out the statement at 11:00. A few minutes later the President called me in to his office and said he wanted to discuss this further. He was really mad at what he termed “the complete arrogance of McCarthy”—Walking up and down behind his desk and speaking in rapid fire order he said the following:

“This amounts to nothing but a wholesale subversion of public service. McCarthy is making exactly the same plea of loyalty to him that Hitler made to the German people. Both tried to set up personal loyalty within the Government while both were using the pretense of fighting Communism. McCarthy is trying deliberately to subvert the people we have in Government, people who are sworn to obey the law, the Constitution and their superior officers. I think this is the most disloyal act we have ever had by anyone in the Government of the United States.”

The President then sat down at his desk and said that he supposed he will be asked this question at his press conference. I said I was sure it would come up. He said, “Make sure it does because I’ll tell you now what I’m going to say—I am going to tell the newsmen that in my opinion this is the most arrogant invitation to subversion and disloyalty that I have ever heard of. I am going to also say that if such an invitation is accepted by any employee of the Government and we find out who that employee is, he will

be fired on the spot if a civilian and court martialled on the spot if a military man. I won't stand for it for one minute.”

The President then asked if it would not be possible to feed such a speech to [Michigan] Senator [Charles E.] Potter to be delivered on the floor of the Senate on this subject. I countered with the suggestion that maybe the best way to do would be to build up public opinion first. The President thought that was a good idea and after discussion we decided that it would be best for me on my own to call certain key people that I knew in radio, television and the newspapers to get this point of view over. I did that in the afternoon. The President also told me that I should do this on my own and should not let anyone even in the White House know what I was doing.... This is a fundamental fight and one I am sure we can win, but one to which I am also sure we will have to give a lot of attention to see that our point of view is accurately reflected in radio, television and the papers throughout the country.



## The Rise and Fall of Joseph McCarthy

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

### Activity #3: The Fall of Joseph McCarthy

**Directions (Group #2):** Read the following documents. After you have done so, write a paragraph explaining how the events described in them might have contributed to McCarthy's downfall. Be prepared to share this paragraph with the class.

Excerpts from the Army-McCarthy Hearings: <http://historymatters.gmu.edu/d/6444>

[White House Chief of Staff Sherman Adams, with Eisenhower's permission, testified before McCarthy's committee in relation to McCarthy's accusation that communists had infiltrated the U.S. Army. However, his testimony quickly moved away from this subject to charges that McCarthy and his chief assistant, Roy Cohn, had put pressure on the Army to give special treatment to Cohn's friend, G. David Schine.]

Mr. ADAMS. About that time these two friends left, and because I wanted Senator McCarthy to restate before Mr. Cohn what he had told me on the courthouse steps, I said, "Let's talk about Schine."

That started a chain of events, an experience similar to none which I have had in my life.

Mr. Cohn became extremely agitated, became extremely abusive. He cursed me and then Senator McCarthy. The abuse went in waves. He would be very abusive and then it would kind of abate and things would be friendly for a few moments. Everybody would eat a little bit more, and then it would start in again. It just kept on.

I was trying to catch a 1:30 train, but Mr. Cohn was so violent by then that I felt I had better not do it and leave him that angry with me and that angry with Senator McCarthy because of a remark I had made. So I stayed and missed my 1:30 train. I thought surely I would be able to get out of there by 2:30. The luncheon concluded.

Mr. JENKINS. You say you were afraid to leave Senator McCarthy alone there with him? Mr. Adams, what did he say? You say he was very abusive.

Mr. ADAMS. He was extremely abusive.

Mr. JENKINS. Was or not any obscene language used?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. Just omit that and tell what he did say which constituted abuse, in your opinion.

Mr. ADAMS. I have stated before, sir, the tone of voice has as much to do with abuse as words. I do not remember the phrases, I do not remember the sentences, but I do remember the violence.

Mr. JENKINS. Do you remember the subject?

Mr. ADAMS. The subject was Schine. The subject was the fact—the thing that Cohn was angry about, the thing that he was so violent about, was the fact that, (1), the Army was not agreeing to an assignment for Schine and, (2), that Senator McCarthy was not supporting his staff in its efforts to get Schine assigned to New York. So his abuse was directed partly to me and partly to Senator McCarthy.

As I say, it kind of came in waves. There would be a period of extreme abuse, and then there would be a period where it would get almost back to normal, and ice cream would be ordered, and then about halfway through that a little more of the same. I missed the 2:30 train, also.

This violence continued. It was a remarkable thing. At first Senator McCarthy seemed to be trying to conciliate. He seemed to be trying to conciliate Cohn and not to state anything contrary to what he had stated to me in the morning. But then he more or less lapsed into silence. . . .

So I went down to room 101. Mr. Cohn was there and Mr. Carr was there. As I remember, we lunched together in the Senate cafeteria, and everything was peaceful. When we returned to room 101, toward the latter part of the conversation I asked Cohn—I knew that 90 percent of all inductees ultimately face overseas duty and I knew that one day we were going to face that problem with Mr. Cohn as to Schine. So I thought I would lay a little groundwork for future trouble I guess. I asked him what would happen if Schine got overseas duty.

Mr. JENKINS. You mean you were breaking the news gently, Mr. Adams?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes, sir; that is right. I asked him what would happen if Schine got overseas duty. He responded with vigor and force, “Stevens is through as Secretary of the Army.”

I said, “Oh, Roy,” something to this effect, “Oh, Roy, don’t say that. Come on. Really, what is going to happen if Schine gets overseas duty?”

He responded with even more force, “We will wreck the Army.”

Then he said, “The first thing we are going to do is get General Ryan for the way he has treated Dave at Fort Dix. Dave gets through at Fort Dix tomorrow or this week, and as soon as he is gone we are going to get General Ryan for the obscene way in which he has permitted Schine to be treated up there.”

Then he said, “I wouldn’t put it past you to do this. We will start investigations. We have enough stuff on the Army to keep investigations going indefinitely, and if anything like such-and-such doublecross occurs, that is what we will do.”

This remark was not to be taken lightly in the context in which it was given to me. . . .

\*\*\*\*\*

Mr. JENKINS. You will recall, Mr. Cohn, that he testified that you said that if Schine went overseas, Stevens was through as Secretary of the Army?

Mr. COHN. I heard him say that, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Did you or not?

Mr. COHN. No, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Did you say anything like that, Mr. Cohn?

Mr. COHN. No, sir, and my recollection is that I did not. I have talked to Mr. Carr who was sitting there the whole time, and he says I did not. . . .

Mr. JENKINS. All right, now you are saying you did not say it, Mr. Cohn?

Mr. COHN. Yes, sir. I am saying I am sure I did not make that statement, and I am sure that Mr. Adams and anybody else with any sense, and Mr. Adams has a lot of sense, could ever believe that I was threatening to wreck the Army or that I could wreck the Army. I say, sir, that the statement is ridiculous.

Mr. JENKINS. I am talking about Stevens being through as Secretary of the Army.

Mr. COHN. That is equally ridiculous, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. And untrue?

Mr. COHN. Yes, sir, equally ridiculous and untrue, I could not cause the President of the United States to remove Stevens as Secretary of the Army. . . .

[Later in the hearings the following heated exchange occurred between McCarthy himself and Joseph N. Welch, the Army's chief counsel.]

Senator MCCARTHY. ...[I]n view of Mr. Welch's request that the information be given once we know of anyone who might be performing any work for the Communist Party, I think we should tell him that he has in his law firm a young man named Fisher whom he recommended, incidentally, to do work on this committee, who has been for a number of years a member of an organization which was named, oh, years and years ago, as the legal bulwark of the Communist Party, an organization which always swings to the defense of anyone who dares to expose Communists. I certainly assume that Mr. Welch did not know of this young man at the time he recommended him as the assistant counsel for this committee, but he has such terror and such a great desire to know where anyone is located who may be serving the Communist cause, Mr. Welch, that I thought we should just call to your attention the fact that your Mr. Fisher, who is still in your law firm today, whom you asked to have down here looking over the secret and classified material, is a member of an organization, not named by me but named by various committees, named by the Attorney General, as I recall, and I think I quote this verbatim, as "the legal bulwark of the Communist Party." He belonged to that for a sizable number of years, according to his own admission, and he belonged to it long after it had been exposed as the legal arm of the Communist Party.

Knowing that, Mr. Welch, I just felt that I had a duty to respond to your urgent request that before sundown, when we know of anyone serving the Communist cause, we let the agency know. We are now letting you know that your man did belong to this organization for, either 3 or 4 years, belonged to it long after he was out of law school.

I don't think you can find anyplace, anywhere, an organization which has done more to defend Communists—I am again quoting the report—to defend Communists, to defend espionage agents, and to aid the Communist cause, than the man whom you originally wanted down here at your right hand....

I am not asking you at this time to explain why you tried to foist him on this committee. Whether you knew he was a member of that Communist organization or not, I don't know. I assume you did not, Mr. Welch, because I get the impression that, while you are quite an actor, you play for a laugh, I don't think you have any conception of the danger of the Communist Party. I don't think you yourself would ever knowingly aid the Communist cause. I think you are unknowingly aiding it when you try to burlesque this hearing in which we are attempting to bring out the facts, however....

Mr. WELCH. Senator McCarthy, I think until this moment—

Senator MCCARTHY. Jim, will you get the news story to the effect that this man belonged to this Communist-front organization? Will you get the citations showing that this was the legal arm of the Communist Party, and the length of time that he belonged, and the fact that he was recommended by Mr. Welch? I think that should be in the record.

Mr. WELCH. You won't need anything in the record when I have finished telling you this. Until this moment, Senator, I think I never really gauged your cruelty or your recklessness. Fred Fisher is a young man who went to the Harvard Law School and came into my firm and is starting what looks to be a brilliant career with us.

When I decided to work for this committee I asked Jim St. Clair, who sits on my right, to be my first assistant. I said to Jim, "Pick somebody in the firm who works under you that you would like." He chose Fred Fisher and they came down on an afternoon plane. That night, when he had taken a little stab at trying to see what the case was about, Fred Fisher and Jim St. Clair and I went to dinner together. I then said to these two young men, "Boys, I don't know anything about you except I have always liked you, but if there is anything funny in the life of either one of you that would hurt anybody in this case you speak up quick."

Fred Fisher said, "Mr. Welch, when I was in law school and for a period of months after, I belonged to the Lawyers Guild," as you have suggested, Senator. He went on to say, "I am secretary of the Young Republicans League in Newton with the son of Massachusetts' Governor, and I have the respect and admiration of the 25 lawyers or so in [the prestigious law firm] Hale & Dorr."

I said, "Fred, I just don't think I am going to ask you to work on the case. If I do, one of these days that will come out and go over national television and it will just hurt like the dickens."

So, Senator, I asked him to go back to Boston.

Little did I dream you could be so reckless and cruel as to do an injury to that lad. It is true he is still with Hale & Dorr. It is true that he will continue to be with Hale & Dorr. It is, I regret to say, equally true that I fear he shall always bear a scar needlessly inflicted by you. If it were in my power to forgive

you for your reckless cruelty, I will do so. I like to think I am a gentleman, but your forgiveness will have to come from someone other than me....

Senator MCCARTHY. I just give this man's record, and I want to say, Mr. Welch, that it has been labeled long before he became a member, as early as 1944— [...]

Mr. WELCH. Let us not assassinate this lad further, Senator. You have done enough. Have you no sense of decency sir, at long last? Have you left no sense of decency?

"Damage": *Collier's* Assesses the Army-McCarthy Hearings: <http://historymatters.gmu.edu/d/6449>

[The following appeared in the August 6, 1954 issue of the popular magazine *Collier's*.]

Now that the Army-McCarthy hearings have been history for a month, and the soap operas have reinherited the daytime TV channels, we should like to do a final review of the long-run show from Washington, and try to summarize its effect—aside from the subcommittee's report.

We suppose the effect can be summarized in one word: damage. The legislative operations of Congress must have been delayed. The morale of the armed forces certainly could not have been heightened by the hearings. And our friends in other countries were obviously bewildered and dismayed by the goings on, with a consequent impairment of American prestige. But the greatest damage, we believe, occurred in the millions of homes where the televised proceedings were seen and heard....

What must many Americans have thought...seeing government in action for the first time! It was a carnival, a sprawling, brawling travesty. It was a performance to shame some of the leading participants, who seemed to forget that their hammy hokum and snarling words were being seen across the country and heard around the world.

How much damage was done cannot be calculated. But fortunately the carnival is over. Now let us hope that responsible members of party and government will take over and, without any further side-show diversions, guide us wisely through the crises that face the country. And let us also hope that those citizens who were shocked by the recent burlesque of responsible government will be assured that some of the performers are not typical of the men in the Capitol who, through the years, have helped to make America great and strong and just.



## The Rise and Fall of Joseph McCarthy

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

### Activity #3: The Fall of Joseph McCarthy

**Directions (Group #3):** Read the following documents. After you have done so, write a paragraph explaining how the events described in them might have contributed to McCarthy's downfall. Be prepared to share this paragraph with the class.

Senate Resolution 301: Censure of Senator Joseph McCarthy (1954):

<http://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?doc=86&page=transcript>

[The following resolution was sponsored by Republican Senator Ralph Flanders of Vermont, a longtime critic of McCarthy. Debate began on July 30, 1954, but disagreements over the precise wording of the measure continued for months. Finally, on December 2, the resolution—as worded below—passed by a vote of 67 to 22.]

Resolved, That the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. McCarthy, failed to cooperate with the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration in clearing up matters referred to that subcommittee which concerned his conduct as a Senator and affected the honor of the Senate and, instead, repeatedly abused the subcommittee and its members who were trying to carry out assigned duties, thereby obstructing the constitutional processes of the Senate, and that this conduct of the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. McCarthy, is contrary to senatorial traditions and is hereby condemned.

Sec 2. The Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. McCarthy, in writing to the chairman of the Select Committee to Study Censure Charges (Mr. Watkins [Senator Arthur Watkins, Republican from Utah]) after the Select Committee had issued its report and before the report was presented to the Senate charging three members of the Select Committee with "deliberate deception" and "fraud" for failure to disqualify themselves; in stating to the press on November 4, 1954, that the special Senate session that was to begin November 8, 1954, was a "lynch-party"; in repeatedly describing this special Senate session as a "lynch bee" in a nationwide television and radio show on November 7, 1954; in stating to the public press on November 13, 1954, that the chairman of the Select Committee (Mr. Watkins) was guilty of "the most unusual, most cowardly things I've ever heard of" and stating further: "I expected he would be afraid to answer the questions, but didn't think he'd be stupid enough to make a public statement"; and in characterizing the said committee as the "unwitting handmaiden," "involuntary agent" and "attorneys-in-fact" of the Communist Party and in charging that the said committee in writing its report "imitated Communist methods -- that it distorted, misrepresented, and omitted in its effort to manufacture a plausible rationalization" in support of its recommendations to the Senate, which characterizations and charges were contained in a statement released to the press and inserted in the Congressional Record of November 10, 1954, acted contrary to senatorial ethics and tended to bring the Senate into dishonor and disrepute, to obstruct the constitutional processes of the Senate, and to impair its dignity; and such conduct is hereby condemned.