ED 423 556   CS 509 898

AUTHOR   Townsend, Rebecca M.
TITLE   McCarthyism's Rhetorical Norms.
PUB DATE   1997-11-22
NOTE   42p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National
              Communication Association (83rd, Chicago, IL, November
              19-23, 1997). Paper is based on a chapter of author's
              Master's thesis, "The Transformation of 'Tolerance' in the
              Age of McCarthyism: A Case of Problematic Rhetorical
              Remembrance."
PUB TYPE   Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Communism; Discourse Analysis; Government Role; *Language
              Role; *Metaphors; *Persuasive Discourse; *Political Issues;
              *Rhetorical Criticism
IDENTIFIERS   Cold War; Congress; Historical Background; *McCarthy
              (Joseph); McCarthyism; *Rhetorical Stance

ABSTRACT
              Rhetorical norms of early McCarthyist discourse reveal a
reliance upon images of chaos and the body. Through such metaphors, rhetors
crafted a model of discussion that feminized "democracy" and "tolerance" to
support anti-Communist measures and de-legitimize their opponents. Political
variety was coded as deviant to national identity. "Tolerance" became a
warrant for the argument to contain political freedom. The paper's
examination of congressional deliberations of contempt of Congress citations,
the Subversive Activities Control Act, and Senator McCarthy's own rhetoric
shows the development of the rhetorical norms of McCarthyism. (Includes 84
notes; contains 45 works cited.) (Author/NKA)

ED 423 556

By

Rebecca M. Townsend
Department of Communication, University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA 01003

National Communication Association
Public Address Division
Debut Paper

83rd Annual Convention
Chicago, Illinois

November 22, 1997

1

Contact information:
Department of Communication, Machmer Hall, University of Massachusetts, Box 34815, Amherst, MA 01003-4815
phone: (413) 545-1311   fax: (413) 545-6399   Email: townsend@comm.umass.edu

Abstract

McCarthyism's Rhetorical Norms

Rhetorical norms of early McCarthyist discourse reveal a reliance upon images of chaos and the body. Through such metaphors, rhetors crafted a model of discussion that feminized "democracy" and "tolerance" to support anti-Communist measures and de-legitimize their opponents. Political variety was coded as deviant to national identity. "Tolerance" became a warrant for the argument to contain political freedom. I examine congressional deliberations of contempt of congress citations, the Subversive Activities Control Act, and Senator McCarthy's own rhetoric to show the development of the rhetorical norms of McCarthyism.

The incipient stages of the American national security state found both bodies of Congress debating and constructing the image of a national enemy. Important pieces of legislation were passed from 1947-1954 which helped to cement this condition. These included the National Security Act of 1947, the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1948, and the Internal Security Act of 1950. Also important were the citations of contempt Congress issued against individual citizens. These citations played a key role in "proving" that the enemy consisted of real people who represented thousands of others plotting to destroy America and all it stood for. In their analysis of President Harry S. Truman's Loyalty Program, Lynn Boyd Hinds and Theodore Otto Windt, Jr. recognize a crucial rhetorical precept of the Cold War that "the security of the nation be placed before the rights of citizens."[1] Such a position was made incontestable; variations to the position were preemptively discredited through both the model of discussion and the metaphoric clusters rhetors employed.

The rhetorical preparation for the national security state in post-war America gave birth to McCarthyism and an attendant set of rhetorical norms.[2] These norms generally are difficult to perceive, but when violated, they become glaringly conspicuous. As I will explain in this essay, the predominant norms of McCarthyism included: (1) a general impatience with democratic deliberation; (2) a marginalizing of opposition through gendered metaphoric linkages; (3) an association of progressive causes and positions with guilt; and (4) a grounding of any deliberation in anti-Communism, so that anti-Communism was itself unquestioned. Working together, these norms yield a narrative of "tolerance" that is repressive.[3] A weakened notion of political "tolerance" reduced opponents of oppressive measures like the Internal Security Act of 1950 to effeminate hysterics. Subsequently, disagreement on fundamental issues disappeared in

the early 1950s. Patterns of congressional debate on these measures reveal that opponents of

these norms relied initially on strong notions of democracy, but reverted later to the legislation's

proponents' view that evil existed in the world, disagreeing only on how best to eradicate its

threat. The proponents' choices of metaphors such as "menace," "disease," "madness,"

"vulnerability," "subversion," and "deviance" enabled them to appeal to the corporeality of the

public's fears, and constrained the opposition into arguing from a restrictive set of normative

premises. Later in the developed stages of McCarthyism, such bodily images of anti-

Communism developed into themes of moral and political deviance.

<h3 style="text-align:center">Analyses of McCarthyism and Tolerance</h3>

In this essay, I focus my analysis on the emerging norms of McCarthyism, which featured

a marginalization of opposition to anti-Communism, found in congressional debate. The

narrative I weave from this material fills in gaps of the traditional story of McCarthyism.[4] This

traditional story is also present in academic studies. Conventionally, Senator McCarthy is the

primary agent of McCarthyism. In this essay, the story becomes more complicated than that.

More actors enter the scene. Their collective agency helps to form the act of McCarthyism,

together helping to craft a repressive "tolerance" through their public discourse.

Most rhetorical analyses of McCarthyism have failed to examine tolerance in connection

with it, and their critique of McCarthyism is insufficient.[5] Marcuse analyzes tolerance

philosophically as a repressive force, contending that there are two kinds of tolerance: passive

and active. "Pure tolerance" is an active form, and its practice has the effect of safeguarding the

"already established machinery of discrimination." He claims that pure tolerance protects the

political Right as well as the Left, arguing that "the altered social structure tends to weaken the effectiveness of tolerance toward dissenting and oppositional movements and to strengthen conservative and reactionary forces. Equality of tolerance becomes abstract, spurious."[6] It is this abstract form that tolerance takes in a repressive society. Marcuse's characterization of tolerance thus enables a broader understanding of what is often a reified term, and sets us in a position to examine the rhetorical usage of "tolerance" as an argumentative warrant with attention to the ways in which its meaning shifts and alters.

Philip Wander and Robert Newman both contribute more productive understandings of the role that McCarthyism plays in American rhetorical culture.[7] Wander examines the meaning of "America" in politics and popular culture. He notes that Fascism's demise left Communism as the predominant political enemy after World War II. Anti-Communists promoted an intolerant understanding of "America." Policies were created out of this interpretive structure, and the basic structures have remained in place, albeit under different names. Wander observes that there has been a "recuperation of anti-Communist ideology," and in its most recent form, "liberal means fellow traveler, and fellow-traveling is linked with child-pornographers, welfare breeders, rapists, abortionists, homosexuals, along with those who want to redistribute the wealth of hard-working Americans."[8]

In a carefully contextualized understanding of the early Cold War years and their implications for future foreign policy, Robert Newman positions McCarthy in a special role in securing the strengthening of the China myths in U.S. foreign and domestic policy. In his 1975 essay, "Lethal Rhetoric: The Selling of the China Myths" Newman asserts that a key reason America was involved in the then just recent Vietnam War was because of the grip myths about

China had on the U.S. collective mind. Presidents Kennedy and Johnson had significant fears of right-wing attacks on them for being "soft on communism," and they acted on those fears. With substantial historical support, Newman articulates an understanding of how various China myths were peddled to the public and how they created an environment that precluded alternative solutions to foreign policy questions. This is the closest any rhetorical analysis of McCarthyism comes to considering larger dimensions of rhetorical practice, like narrative or myth, yet it isolates McCarthy from the larger practices he made famous. He places McCarthy as the right actor for the scene, publicly articulating most clearly what anti-Communism entailed.

In his conclusion Newman cites Barbra Tuchman to the effect that: "McCarthyism is never dead in this country,"[9] an understanding that extends beyond most other scholarly explanations or interpretations of the man or the ism. Writing in 1975, he forecasts that similar foreign policy questions may endanger "a Democrat in the White House" if one ever comes again.[10] Could such a president resist the strong constituencies of anti-Communists, whatever their present-day form? Both Wander and Newman do present a more nuanced appreciation of McCarthyism than most other studies. Their examinations allow the present to be considered part of an ongoing process through which a version of repressive tolerance is perpetuated. More importantly for my purposes, they open the door for a rhetorical history of "tolerance" as an argumentative form that focuses on a significant event in its most contemporary transformation. There remains the need for an understanding of McCarthyism as a developing narrative with possibilities for positive transformation.

In examining selections of congressional deliberations on contempt of Congress citations, the Subversive Activities Control Act, and McCarthy's own rhetoric, I want to explicate what I

regard as the rhetorical norms of McCarthyism.[11] Although they are but three slices of the rhetoric of McCarthyism, they are all significantly connected. These products of Congress, including the National Security Act, signaled a turn in America's domestic affairs. Gendered discourses of fear characterized these early stages of the American security state, which lasted well into the latter half of the twentieth century.

McCarthyite rhetoric produced a shift in the usage of a keyword in the nation's political lexicon. "Tolerance" became a warrant for the argument to contain political freedom. The set of norms McCarthyite rhetors constructed, adhered to, and only occasionally violated produced a rhetorical culture that had significant effects upon American discourse then and now. Thomas B. Farrell explains that rhetoric is "the collaborative art of addressing and guiding decision and judgment."[12] Senators and representatives in Congress drew from their various socio-cultural and political backgrounds, constituencies, and hierarchical statuses in government to situate themselves on a continuum of positions toward proposed legislation. As time advanced, however, and the rhetoric of fear became more and more a starting point rather than a strand of argument, the range of possible judgments available to legislators narrowed considerably.

Congressional discussion of the Communist threat was partially responsible for the status of the threat as an "occasion." In Farrell's terms, an occasion typically "begins only with public awareness of a brute actuality."[13] It is more useful here to understand the debates as aiding in the construction of a threat so as to make it an actuality. Congress provided part of the forum that constructed this threat. The 80th and 81st Congresses (of 1947-1951) were formal bodies which helped to fortify the performance of anti-Communism as crucial to American identity. They established the rhetorical norms that earned the moniker "McCarthyism." All of the practices

Senator McCarthy made famous find their roots in the emergent national security state of 1947-1949.

I will demonstrate how the period just prior to McCarthy's reign as a political force was linked rhetorically to the subsequent period of his direct influence. The norms of each stage comprise a material rhetorical bridge, most readily recognized through the patterns of metaphorical clusters. Robert L. Ivie shows that:

> locating metaphors associated with ideographs is central to understanding the relationship between political ideology and practical argument in foreign affairs. The pattern of inter-referentiality formed by the convergence of various tropes on a single cluster of ideographs such as "freedom," "liberty," and "democracy" establishes an operational sub-universe of discourse which guides and constrains the lines of argument concerning foreign policy.[14]

Metaphors in discourse about both the internal and external security of the United States can point to the constraints on the rhetors. They can signal where their limits of invention are placed.

Metaphor and National Identity

In McCarthyist discourse, bodily metaphors are prevalent as part of the rhetoric of fear. Bodily images are linked to fear through two main channels: gendered rhetoric and disease/deviance imagery. Gendered rhetoric is predominantly connected, in McCarthyist discourse, to disease images. Disease in this case includes forms of deviance. Edwin Black explains the Radical Right's use of disease metaphors, specifically "the cancer of communism," and Ivie examines George F. Kennan's use of disease imagery in his Long Telegram and "X"

article.[15] Together, Black and Ivie demonstrate that disease imagery functions to heighten the sense of fear in auditors, weakening the practice of democracy. Similarly, bodily metaphors also encompass notions of gender. In McCarthyist rhetoric, the two metaphoric clusters of gender and disease were linked through imagery of deviance. This essay will articulate just how this linkage occurred and how it diluted the vibrancy of democratic practice.

It will be useful to scrutinize representative parts of the larger debates for the metaphorical patterns Congress wielded. Ivie has already examined the rhetorical patterns of "darkness" McCarthy employed at the later stages of his career.[16] Indeed, these metaphors inhabit this incipient discourse as well, but they do not comprise the most significant patterns for discouraging opposition to security measures. The scanty opposition to such legislative measures failed due to the norms that proponents were forming. Once formed, the opposition had to argue from within the conceptual frameworks and metaphoric clusters of such restrictive norms. The metaphorical clusters centered on a dangerously intolerable situation that found democracy and freedom to be vulnerable and in need of security through tough combat. The body politic, from this view, had tolerated the deviance of Communist activity for far too long, and America had to legislate against such subversion to protect "her" liberties. In this essay, I discuss this pattern's development in its embryonic stage, when most of the norms of the rhetorical culture were engendered.

Participants in the process of deliberation can cast that process as supportive of, or as a hindrance to, national security. As David Campbell shows, America's understanding of "security" and "danger" is tied to its identity as a nation. Americans have calibrated their "ethical boundaries of identity" in ways that maximize a gendered orientation toward danger.[17]

Campbell discusses the "gendered understanding of reason" as "defining orientations of our existence."[18] Furthermore, he demonstrates, the "trope of 'the body' is central to the moral space of our identity."[19] When the nation deliberates the severity of a danger, and Americans are active in constructing the danger, such deliberation is often performed so that the most powerful discourses have a masculine cast to them. If reason is masculinized, those who take notice of, or integrate, concerns other than strict logic are feminized and coded as deviant. As Edward Said explains, "Centrality is identity, what is powerful, important, and *ours*. Centrality maintains balance between extremes; it endows ideas with the balances of moderation, rationality, pragmatism." Further, he argues, "centrality gives rise to semi-official narratives that authorize and provoke certain sequences of cause and effect, while at the same time preventing counter-narratives from emerging."[20] If those in power articulate their position as the center of reason and strength--even if their performance suggests a discrepancy--it becomes easier for them to discredit their opposition. Linda H. Kerber argues that "we live in a world in which authority has traditionally validated itself by distance from the feminine and from what is understood to be effeminate."[21] Gendering opposition feminine marginalizes it, and thus discounts it as illegitimate.

When discourses of power are gendered, and when bodily metaphors are significant in such discourses, the nation's sense of democracy and identity are at stake. Ivie asks, "What . . . rhetorically constitutes a healthy, strong, secure, and enduring democratic practice at home so that the nation may feel less threatened from abroad?"[22] He answers that democracy construed so competently would entail a "rhetorical . . . conception of symbolic action that privileges politics--i.e., political discourse--as the *arbiter elegantiarum*."[23] This rhetorical democracy would resist

unwarranted appeals to fear. "Tolerance," a key term in American liberal-democratic governance, would be figured predominantly in terms that suggest a strength through diversity. It is important to understand how the factor of gender short-circuited deliberation and ensconced "tolerance" with a repressive meaning.

Contempt of Congress

The House Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC) had been functioning sporadically since 1938. In 1947, however, it began to pick up considerable steam. With the "Hollywood Ten's" refusal to testify before the committee, Congress became increasingly aware that people could and did refuse to participate. Lesser-known individuals refused as well. To maintain its legitimacy as an investigatory body, Congress needed to make scapegoats of these resisters. This tactic became part of the larger "American Inquisition," as Cedric Belfrage describes it, but it was nonetheless a crucial McCarthyite practice.[24] Later legislation restricting speech would follow because these individuals were said to represent thousands of other agents of chaos. Congress asked Americans to accept such limits on their freedoms. Congress voted citations for contempt on numerous individuals who resisted HUAC in any way. As a primary method of clamping down on dissent, individual citizens were issued subpoenas to appear before HUAC. As I will explain, any resistance to HUAC's demands were highly publicized. In this way, resisters were "exposed" and either marked for shunning or actually shunned by society.

In early 1947, this method was still the principal means for eradicating radicals or uncooperative witnesses. That year Congress issued two citations for contempt against Leon Josephson and Eugene Dennis, prominent members of the Communist Party, U.S.A. These

citations served as springboards for vituperative speeches condemning Communism. Josephson and Dennis, according to Rep. J. Parnell Thomas, committed a "bold and contemptuous challenge of the very sovereignty of our Government." They were "bent upon destroying that very Government." They, like other Communists, "flagrantly serv[ed] as agents of a foreign government." Such agents were rhetorically separated from the U.S., since it was assumed that anarchy could not be home-grown. Rep. Thomas asked whether the U.S. would "be cowed and insulted by this Communist conspiracy?" Furthermore, "their immunity must cease" and they should be "prosecuted for their violations." Congress was able to link images of chaos to bodily images through such disease and deviance metaphors. This rhetorical "exposure" was not enough because "investigations . . . become the burial ground for action."[25] By such suggestions of death, movement toward legislated repression of free speech gained further warrant.

Slow prosecution of individuals was not the only concern of these rhetors; death for the nation was at the core of their anxiety. With the threat of death, dissent was construed as only hastening demise. Rep. John S. Wood urged that "there should not be a dissenting voice" in Congress over these citations, since the problem concerned none other than "the broad and fundamental question of upholding the dignity and preserving the sovereignty and authority of the Congress itself." Those who would not answer the questions HUAC asked were "afraid," according to Rep. J. Hardin Peterson. Congress, in these proceedings, was "contending with the brains and the ability and the desires of the enemies of the American people to destroy . . . this Nation." The "duty" of Congress, declared Rep. John McDowell, was to find out "who they are, where they are, and how they operate." One such enemy was a "murderous little Moscow agent." Congress received little criticism for such proceedings, criticism which McDowell described as

only to "hysterical and silly falsehoods." The "actual menaces to the American way of life" were the targets of such exposure, but unfortunately, it seems, "America has looked complacently on these destructive rodents that have been busy gnawing at the foundations of our country and screaming for the protection our government gives decent citizens."[26] Congressional members were beginning to get anxious about the usefulness of the process of deliberation.

Both opposition members and Communists were linked to rodents, creatures who typically thrive in darkness. According to some in Congress, the opposition to anti-Communists was perpetuating a culture that allowed such traitors protection from the very country they were trying to subvert. This culture was of a darkened hue. By framing the Communists as enemies destroying the body politic from within, rhetors were able to heighten a fundamental sense of danger to America. Such a danger would then virtually warrant suicidal attempts to save the nation.[27]

The legislators painted an image of Communists and the individuals under consideration that relied upon their discord-causing activities. Such discord was life-threatening and would lead to national dissipation. The Congress and the nation had delicate constitutions and were unable to withstand the rigors of such confusion. One of the principal aims of Communists, professed Rep. Karl E. Mundt, was "to weaken [Congress's] influence if they cannot destroy the institution entirely." Dennis, in particular, was "trying to destroy freedom here in the most important bastion of its existence. . . . a political Rhett Butler trying to create chaos and destroy and wreck our free civilization," by destroying the body politic. Not content with that description, Rep. Mundt elaborated that Dennis was:

a political jackal along with his fellow Communists, realizing that they grow fattest when the State comes closest to death. So they do what they can to create labor troubles; do what they can to create tension and conflicts between races, creeds, and groups, because they realize . . . that the best antidote . . . for communism is a successfully working democracy in America. . . . So the communists work to disrupt that; and work to create chaos and conflict and uneasiness because as democracy functions better, they function less successfully."[28]

But Rep. Mundt was not so sure that democracy was functioning, since it was always at risk and America "cannot decrease in our eternal vigilance."[29] It was feared that "jackals" would thrive like a cancer off of the body politic. Rep. Mundt's problem, as presented, called for solutions that failed to enhance the practice of democracy. If American citizens failed in their vigilance, America would find itself in a "vulnerable position." Mundt argued that Communism had to be "exposed to full view, naked and undisguised, as the un-American virus which it actually is." The disease that plagued America required the panacea of containment and repression, otherwise, Communism would "kill off democracy." The aberrant enemy "resorts to bullets whenever ballots go against it." Communists offer a "whimpering cry . . . pleading to be unrestrained in their efforts to destroy America." As the agents of chaos and disease were characterized as offering weak plaints for freedom, Congress paved the way for their effeminization. Freedom is feminized to make it appear vulnerable and to warrant stereotypically aggressive masculine action in its defense. Such action suppresses feminine tendencies, including the exercise of freedom and democracy. The enemy is femininity but the Communist enemy is not feminine-- indeed, the enemy takes advantage of femininity. America is at risk only if it *allows itself* to

become feminine. The mastering of the enemy had to be achieved through a masculine, hardline stance, which distanced Congress from encouraging the strong practice of democracy. Mundt thundered, "This is not a fight which can be won by faint-hearted warriors. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot cannot defeat Red Fascism." Congressmen ran the risk of being "smeared" themselves. Rep. Mundt further warned Americans to watch for "agents slyly peddling their slimy propaganda," for Communism was "tightening its hold upon the jugular vein of American life."[30] Once the Congress was able rhetorically to place the nation in jeopardy, they were able to silence dissent.

The insufficient work being done to control this threat was perceived as indicative of the government's own weak links. The failure of the attorney general to prosecute Communists meant that he and those before him were, according to Rep. Mundt, "guilty of one of three things: Either they are afraid of the Communist Party or they are dominated by the Communist Party or they do not know that the Communist Party exists." The Communist Party, Mundt contended, was on a "crusade to pervert and control the youth of America."[31] The Communists, according to Rep. John M. Robison, "advocate the overthrow of this Government . . . by force and violence."[32] A degenerate enemy was assumed to have the power to crush the U.S. in part by turning the youth into vulnerable citizens, homosexuals, or effeminate men. Freedom and democracy are associated with discourse, and "girls" and gay men are depicted as highly verbal. This makes for the problem of associating democracy as a discourse with positive gendering, and it emphasizes the problem of gender and democracy.

The main challenger throughout these contempt proceedings was Rep. Vito Marcantonio of New York. He found the proceedings themselves to involve "issues of fundamental

democracy" that were "unconstitutional and antidemocratic." The other congressmen had

"severely damaged" democracy in their "hysterical persecution" of Communists. Marcantonio

provided a brief history of such occasions, noting that "a wave of revulsion" overcame

Americans, and they were able to reject such moments of repression.[33] His singular attempts to

sway the Congress were repeatedly and soundly rebuked by comments that, like those of Rep.

Robison, referred to "the silly argument of the gentleman from New York."[34] Indeed, as Rep.

Richard Nixon proclaimed, Congress is "striking a blow for the very freedoms the gentleman

from New York talked about."[35] Marcantonio countered that "at no time has the Supreme Court

of the United States ruled that the Communist Party advocates the overthrow of the Government

by force and violence." Rep. Marcantonio found no recourse in citing the Supreme Court, for

Rep. Rankin charged, "Here is the Supreme Court to which the gentleman from New York

should refer, and that is William Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party." To confound things

further, the Speaker of the House did not see that those remarks were "any reflection" on Rep.

Marcantonio.[36] This pattern of red-baiting opponents enabled legislators to accomplish two

goals: (1) it reinforced their position as defenders of America, and (2) it derisively dismissed

lines of opposition without directly addressing them. By declining to engage and counter

opposition honestly, red-baiters were able to delegitimize their opponent's position.

Congressmen articulated a threat and presented solutions for eradicating it. The answer,

they argued, could be found in the virility of patriotic Americans who could avoid becoming

dupes to Communism. Americans were so generous and giving (stereotypically feminine

qualities) that they could easily fall for cunning trickery, and so they needed to be educated about

subversion. One of the ways congressmen like Rep. Noah Mason explained what they

determined to be the success of the "Communist infiltration" was by claiming that Communists

would "inoculate innocent, unsuspecting Americans" by forming "front" organizations. These

fronts would "spread" Communism.[37] Images of disease were so pervasive that Congress was

oriented toward prescribing vaccinations for the development of a healthy population. In so

doing, they assumed that Americans were incapable of active, intelligent participation in the

practice of democracy. What Congress wished for, argued Rep. Mundt, was a "population of

sturdy Americans" brought about by giving the Federal Bureau of Investigation $50 million.

This would halt America from "inviting the Red armies to walk in when we show weakness at

this critical period."[38] The cultural narratives of the early Cold War, as Alan Nadel shows,

crafted "the pervasive image of a normative American: white, heterosexual, upwardly mobile . . .

generically religious, and uncommonly full of 'common sense.'"[39] This image was popular in

congressional debate. Portraying the opposition as non-white, effeminate, un-American, poor,

and irreligious (or non-Christian), or as members of an elite Ivy-league educated class allowed

anti-Communists to discount from deliberation anyone associated with those labels. This

emerged as a norm that marginalized the representative Others as unfavorably wayward.

"Sturdy" citizens were not depicted as feminine; instead, the label "sturdy" de-feminizes

Americans, discouraging forms of talk like democratic deliberation or dissent.

Communism was fast becoming an enemy without match. If America should hesitate in

resistance to this enemy, this would be interpreted as a frailty that it could not afford. Congress

determined that the transfer of power in Russia from a monarchy to a Communist state caused

this new situation. Rep. Frances P. Bolton explained, "We did not admire Czarist Russia, but we

got along with her. Unfortunately, Communist Russia makes that tolerance difficult if not

impossible."[40] Through such a move, Rep. Bolton was also able to demarcate just who was normal and who was abnormal through the use of "we" and its implied "they." Congressional rhetoric indicated a struggle over what to tolerate. It will become more evident, however, that the struggle was already settled. Members of congress argued that civility toward those of different political stripes than one's own would weaken democracy. Tom Englehardt characterizes the early Cold War period as "mark[ed]" by an "unresolvable tension between exclusion and inclusion . . . between vigilance and tolerance."[41] "Freedom and liberty as we know them," Rep. Gordon L. McDonough justified, "cannot tolerate communism. We must be vigilant and alert to the wiles and insidious influences it is attempting to inflict upon us."[42] In fact, perhaps it is this aspect of America that is the problem. The rape and death of America would be permitted through "tolerance" of dissent. Democracy and liberty were feminized and therefore could not provide sufficient protection for America. Gradually, talk itself-- deliberation--became more and more feminized, signaling the need for the repudiation of talk.

American "tolerance" was becoming part of the foe's weapons from within. Rep. John Rankin made it clear as he read F.B.I. director J. Edgar Hoover's words into the Congressional Record: "In our vaunted tolerance for all peoples the Communist has found our 'Achilles' heel.'"[43] "It is a matter of self-preservation" Hoover continued, and to prevent "penetration" Americans must "battle" along with government. Hoover was adept at figuring Communism as irrational and indecent, a "virulent poison."[44] He ably portrayed America's fragility through tropes of the body. "Tolerance" was part of American democracy, but with this rhetorical figuring of it as the weakest part of America, it became powerless. By this logic, "tolerance" had to be sacrificed to save democracy by legislating restrictions on political liberty.

Legislating Containment

Early McCarthyist rhetoric prepared for the passage of the National Security Act of 1947. Set in this discursive backdrop, the Act abolished the Department of War and replaced it with the Department of Defense, which subsumed the Army, Air Force, Marines, and Navy. This subtle move instantly positioned America as always starting from a position of self-protection. U.S. identity was semantically sealed in the apparent inability of the nation to go on the offensive. The Act also established the Central Intelligence Agency for the purpose of collecting information. Investigation became routine and it was fast on its way to being understood and accepted as necessary. These events launched a new round of obsession with security. Further reliance upon feminized tropes of the body functioning as the normative standard for marginalizing opponents and short-circuiting debate characterized congressional consideration of H.R. 5852, what was to become the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1948 (a.k.a. the Mundt-Nixon Bill). Discussion of this measure involved more dissent than previous congressional discourse on Communism.

The Subversive Activities Control Act of 1948 required every suspected subversive organization or front to register as Communist with the Attorney General. The Act labeled those groups who employed the following "methods" as "Communist fronts:"

> (A) the disruption of trade and commerce, (B) the inciting of economic, social, and racial strife and conflict, (C) the dissemination of propaganda calculated to undermine established government institutions, and (D) corrupting officials of the Government and securing the appointment of their agents and sympathizers to offices and positions in the Government.[45]

Through its vague language, it encompassed a wide range of organizations and subjected them to investigation and restriction. The Act fails to define or otherwise explain any of these methods. It made association with "subversive" groups a crime. Membership was punishable as a felony. Members who were immigrants could lose citizenship. The 319 advocates of this legislation relied heavily on the nation's perceived vulnerability, developing additional rhetorical norms. These norms called for legislating containment, and thus the norms themselves achieved legislated status. Such legislation became necessary to fortify America against the articulated threats.

A major backer of the Act, HUAC's then-Chair, Rep. Thomas, was ill at the time of the floor debate, but he issued a statement on the matter, indicating that the bill was "aimed at coping with the foremost menace to democracy today." The enemy was "nothing more nor less than fifth-column arm of the Soviet Union." The U.S. was fortunate that the HUAC was created; Thomas said it was a "lasting tribute to this body that it [Congress] had the foresight and the vigilance to establish" HUAC. "[O]ur Government never has and never will be caught flat-footed" by the Communists, rhetorically located outside the U.S. The bill was a "sane and effective approach" that would "spell the death of the Communist Party of the United States." Preemptively striking his opponents, Rep. Thomas claimed that it was the Communists who directed the opposition and asserted that their objections were "a lot of poppycock." All the bill would do, he contended, was to allow "a free and democratic people to protect themselves and their Government from destruction."[46]

The measure was claimed necessary because of the nature of the nemesis and the predicament in which the country unwittingly found itself. Proponents like Rep. Rankin argued that the Communists

> that are running riot throughout the world are part of the same old gang that constituted the fifth column of the crucifixion. They hounded the Saviour during the days of his ministry, persecuted him to his ignominious death, derided him during the moment of his dying agony, and gambled for his garments at the foot of the cross; and for 1,900 years they have attempted to undermine and destroy . . . all the institutions that have been built upon the moral precepts of Christianity.[47]

This thinly disguised anti-Semitism remained a constant tactic of proponents. In Russia, Rep. Rankin said, "long-nosed commissars" were said to be responsible for starving millions, reducing the people to cannibalism: "In their frantic agony some of them died eating the dead bodies of their own families." Barbarism of this sort typified the enemy; it was counted as "evidence" of the enemy's lack of stereotypically feminine mothering instincts. Crucifixion imagery also contributed to the association of the nation with weak notions of femininity. The nation would reach its death because of its reluctance to fight back in masculine ways. Communists would likewise hound America. This imagery effectively combined fears of anarchy and subsequent death through gruesome premonitions of life under Communism. Such "ruthless" people were themselves "well-fed." Rep. Rankin declared, "I have never seen a Communist--and unfortunately I have seen one or two in this House--who was not well cared for."[48] The only people, Rep. Mundt promised, who would be "touched" would be Communists, and then only if Congress found that they were "engaged in a conspiracy." But, "[i]f the shoe does not fit, they

do not put it on their foot. If it fits, we nail it on with iron cleats so that they cannot get it off."[49]

Congress denied the Communist Party's legitimacy. Communists were constructed as an

inherently deviant conspiracy. These "advocates of anarchy," according to Rep. Wingate H.

Lucas, had been "feeding on the freedoms which are inherent in our society." Americans had

"actually encouraged" this behavior and "cannot afford to delay any longer."[50] Rep. John

Jennings, Jr. claimed that, "to tolerate them is an outrage and those who ask us to make it easy

for them insult our intelligence."[51] The opposition to such legislation was linked to Communists,

and so became part of the intolerable group of deviants. Rep. Jennings hated "this surrender to

subversive elements that are undertaking to destroy this country." He asked, "Just when will we

get hard in this country? . . . Just when will we reach the end of that tolerance with which we

have heretofore indulged these communists?"[52] Being "hard," an important masculine term,

would save the country.

Legislators argued that democracy was weak and in a "temple" which must be protected.

The "intolerable situation," contended Rep. Walter H. Judd, demanded "self-defense."[53] The

United States, claimed Rep. Lucas, "confronts a world which is a breeding ground for insidious

propaganda"[54] The democratic body is too weak to survive in the actual world. According to

Rep. Mundt the bill "requires the Communists of America to cut the umbilical cord which binds

them to Mother Russia."[55] Rep. Joseph R. Bryson maintained that it would "emasculate

Communists."[56] It was further argued that America should remove the masculine aggressiveness

from Russia, an apparent mother-father which androgynously spawned anarchy. All the sacrifice

the U.S. had endured would then be worth it. America would be able to rest fairly easily. Rep.

Charles J. Kersten explained, "This measure is a sword that separates that limb [of conspiracy]

from the brain that lies abroad. This country could fall from an internal attack but it will never fall from an assault from without though all the powers of hell are hurled against it."[57]

Some opponents, like Rep. Frank Buchanan, claimed that the Subversive Activities Control Bill was "too sweeping" and "use[d] the smear tactic." The bill would "reveal" that Americans "have inherent weaknesses in this Nation whereby we are vitally afraid of criticism--from within."[58] Rep. Arthur J. Klein asked if "we are now so fearful that we resort to the antithesis of our democratic ideals to preserve the faint shadow of representative government?" Opponents asserted that it was the bill that created "an intolerable invasion,"[59] not the Communists, as proponents had previously indicated. Such opponents did not hesitate to point out that America's "fear" produced the call for legislation against Communists. They were careful to make distinctions among the various types of Communism, considering it a more complex phenomenon than proponents had claimed. Rep. Buchanan, citing New York Times Magazine columnist Allan Nevins, found safety in "free opinion, free speech, and a free vote."[60] Rather than Communism, claimed Rep. Toby Morris, "good old Jeffersonian democracy is on the march, and it will ever be."[61] Democracy was not fragile for some of them; indeed, for Rep. Abraham J. Multer, it provided a "shelter" that would "grow from strength to strength" if this bill were not enacted.[62]

While opponents supplied histories of the United States that emphasized its strength, proponents countered them resoundingly with histories emphasizing the "grave dangers" the country "faced" "since its birth." According to Rep. Richard B. Vail, generations of Americans had "borne" their "share of the [bitter] sacrifices periodically required to maintain our national integrity." He thus portrayed these sacrifices as marginally effective at halting the advance of the

invasive enemy. "At this stage it would seem that America was secure--that its position was impregnable. . . . We have no adequate defense against the new weapon that has been in use against us and is at this very moment gnawing at our vitals. . . . Never before have we been forced to stand by helplessly." Through its inaction, proponents argued, America became weak and helpless. As a weak nation, the U.S. was coded as feminine, and the feminization of the nation was crafted so as to require masculine protection. Those placed in the position of arguing against such protection were associated with the defiling invaders. The "hue and cry that has been raised against" this bill was said to come from "sources that when checked have been found to have their roots sunk deep in actual communism or pink liberalism." Liberals were "pink," a very feminine term, close to the red Communists. Opponents, once softened, became feminized and weakened through these moves. This feminization was said to be reflected in the illogical, mad appeals against the bill, because, "[E]very sound American organization approves and supports this bill."[63] Opponents were irrational, since Americans apparently needed to make occasional adjustments to their liberties in order to secure them. Democracy continued to be seen as a discourse, although emanating from a feminine body that needed masculine protection in a world of combat, not words.

The rhetorical norm of feminization continued. Rep. Mundt characterized those who objected to the legislation as "sad-eyed, soft-hearted, bewildered, and befuddled" "rabble,"[64] and Rep. Rankin said opponents were trying to "emasculate" the bill.[65] Rep. Mundt charged that "soft-headed . . . self-proclaimed liberals cry out," but it will be the "[p]atriots of every party and every walk of life [who] will applaud and support this program for protecting the freedoms and liberties which have made America great and which the Communists and their dim-witted dupes

would now destroy."[66] To feminize the opponents aligned them with the insanity of chaos and placed advocates in the position of masculine rationality and power. The red-baiting endured. In some instances, as Rep. McDowell illustrated, opponents were characterized "reaching down into the Communist bag of tricks."[67] Opponents were consistently charged with misunderstanding the bill or deliberately trying to distort it for the purpose of confusing the public. Their arguments were consistently reversed against them. For example, a line of argument that this measure would create a police state was subsequently transformed through the proponents' own vivid definitions of a police state, illustrated with descriptions of the environment said to be preferred by murderous Communists. To counter any appeals to a strong democracy, proponents eventually moved away from mentioning democracy altogether. In one instance, this move was formalized. Rep. Thomas L. Owens recommended an amendment to protect a "representative form of government" rather than democracy. This was accomplished because of the "great deal of confusion" the word "democracy" could cause: "the democratic form of government means one where every person has a voice in that which is taking place--where they can move as a body. It is social equality compared with snobbery. Therefore, we do not have an absolute democracy here."[68] Such confusion was halted before it could occur. The chance that the U.S. would accidentally permit full participation in the practice of democracy would safely be deflected.

Later rhetors exploited the link that proved so effective in disabling dissenters: the connection between a feminized democracy, freedom, and tolerance, and the call for masculine legislation protecting American security. The mind-body connection was actually reinforced, but only in a deviant sense. The minds of Communists were characterized as wholly similar to their perverted bodies. Sen. Pat McCarran quoted General Dwight Eisenhower, who sarcastically

suggested that psychiatrists would help illuminate the abnormalities which afflicted certain elite intellectuals of the nation. Doctors might "provide an ultraviolet ray . . . needed to penetrate deeply into the darkness of Communist motivation"[69]

Standards of Deviation: McCarthy Extends the Patterns

The dangerous deviance that Communists were said to embody was drawn out most deliberately by Senator Joseph McCarthy. In his February 9, 1950 Wheeling, WV speech, Sen. McCarthy started a new round of the Red Scare that earned his name. He charged that this deviance had penetrated into the U.S. State Department, which would help explain the tremendous losses the U.S. incurred in foreign policy. This charge was the most explicit any legislator had made about the infiltration of Communists into government, and this touched off an extension of the earlier HUAC contempt citations, with the crucial difference being that he refused to name the actual 205 "cases" that proved the infiltration. He was content freely to ascribe guilt by association.

In the State Department populated by the "unusual characters"[70] of Sen. McCarthy's invention, the "nest of Communists and Communist sympathizers" and other "bad security risks" made it necessary for increased congressional investigatory powers. If this call was not answered, it would "label the Democratic Party . . . the bedfellow of international communism."[71] Sen. McCarthy helped construct a world in which danger was everywhere and Americans had unnecessarily tolerated it. He challenged that "twisted-thinking intellectuals have taken over the Democratic Party." Apparently Americans could "no longer . . . safely blind our eyes and close our ears to those facts which are shaping up more and more clearly," otherwise they would

"deeply wound and damage mankind." America was "in a position of impotency 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." In order to cure the "emotional hang-over" of American apathy, 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." These "twisted intellectuals" have even captured President Truman as their "prisoner."[72]

According to McCarthy, the problem develops when one Communist is permitted to hold a job in Government, for "he will get some other individual to recommend another Communist so that the breed can be increased." He thus complained that too often these "bad security risks" are "flagrantly homosexual" and share "extremely close connections with other individuals with the same tendencies."[73] The mental and physical deviance that these people were constituted as embodying could somehow proliferate. The attack of homosexuality was an entailment of the bodily images of feminization. Men were attacked for any appearance of stepping outside the margins of what was thought to be normal for masculine behavior. Masculine behavior required sexual relations with females, and anything else was constructed as deviant. The deviance took the characteristics of femininity, with all its rhetorically constituted trappings of passivity, irrationality, and weakness. Such deviants were said to procreate, and thus lessen the effectiveness of protective legislation or departments. Once the label of homosexuality was attached to a person, he or she would attract persecution for their *de facto* position in the margins of society. Opponents to repressive measures were thus linked to the margin. "Marginalization in American culture means," according to Said, "a kind of unimportant provinciality."[74] The

possibility that those on the margin would "talk" or otherwise practice dissent or democracy was

a threat to the center and therefore the nation.

Sen. McCarthy cited one of the "top intelligence men" who said that "there's something

wrong with each one of these individuals. You will find that practically every active Communist

is twisted mentally in some way." There were also things "physically wrong" with some of the

cases he handled, and he recommended that these people should be "discharged" from the federal

payroll "regardless of whether they are shown to have any communistic connection or not." Sen.

McCarthy characterized gays and lesbians as a dangerous threat to be conquered. Groups of

Communists similarly tended to be "close-knit" and hazardous. He found that "bad security risks

. . . are easy blackmail victims." Of course, Sen. McCarthy speculated, they would never want

their identity revealed and most likely would be willing to do anything to prevent that from

happening, even engaging in espionage activities. "Some rather unusual mental aberrations" and

"peculiar mental twists of these gentlemen who are tied-up with some of the Communist

organizations" were great cause for increased investigation.[75] Other senators seemed to agree

with his conclusions, since as Sen. Mundt said, "Government departments are notoriously

weak."[76] By characterizing the enemy in such terms, McCarthyites were able to stand

unswervingly tall, embodying all that is masculine, principled, rational, independent, and

patriotic.

As McCarthy proceeded to develop each "case" file of the supposed subversives in the

State Department, he conceded that "it is possible that some of these persons will get a clean bill

of health" once they have been thoroughly investigated. But the danger to these innocents was

worth the trouble of preemptively judging them guilty. "I think the condition today is so fraught

with danger, I think we are in a period so definitely close to war, that even if we do damage some of the honest employees, I must take only the method I know of whereby I think we can secure a house cleaning."[77] Tolerance of these investigations became even more necessary for security and freedom.

Sen. McCarthy persevered in his efforts to point out those he claimed to be the diseased, ineffectual parties in American government. His rhetoric continued to rely on metaphors of the body and chaos. He found that a "small but dominant percentage of disloyal, twisted, and, in some cases, perverted thinkers . . . were rendering futile the Herculean efforts of the vast number of loyal Americans in the State Department," and also that the "world is being delivered to communism." Yet he would not falter in his self-appointed task, even though "the road has been strewn with the political corpses of those who dared to attempt an exposure" of such "devious and smelly passages."[78] His identity was bound with the nation's identity; both are in danger, yet both must persevere. He considered this self-endangering task his duty to the Nation, since everyone else was complacent and effeminate. He argued: "The mind of the left-wing crowd in the American State Department is as soft as curdled milk."[79] Sen. McCarthy's uses of images of darkness are initiated at this stage.[80] By attacking opponents with charges of mental and therefore sexual deviation, and by attacking homosexuals, he was able to figure himself as the searchlight that brings these people out into the open, so that they may be destroyed. He was able to position others at the dark margins, brought to light through his revelations. At this point in his career, however, Sen. McCarthy was on the rise and portrayed his work similar to a doctor dispensing an unfortunate diagnosis to the country. Later, Sen. McCarthy's depiction of his work would dim, so that he pictured himself routing out the subversives. This would ultimately help

bring about his own downfall when Edward R. Murrow would link him with the Communist

threat he purported to exterminate. And, as Ivie demonstrates, Sen. McCarthy was "bypassing

the principle of free speech and the canons of evidence that are essential to the survival of an

enlightened democracy."[81] While Joe McCarthy could later be bested by such an association, the

deeper, more problematic ironies of McCarthyism remained. Guilt by association, de-

legitimization of dissent, and feminized liberty, democracy, and "tolerance" went largely

unchallenged.

Conclusion

This small segment of the larger Cold War era spawned and perpetuated a rhetorical

culture of fear, accusation, guilt by association, a high premium on conformity, red-baiting of

opposition, and a devaluation of democracy and tolerance. As seen through the three episodes

detailed above, the pattern that rhetorical norms took necessitated that rhetors argue from within

a rhetoric of fear. With contempt of congress citations, congressional McCarthyites began a

victimage ritual of identifying and persecuting individual scapegoats as signs of a larger menace.

Members of Congress characterized these individuals as agents of chaos and disease, coddled by

the American governmental elites. They also de-legitimized the few congressional opponents to

these citations. Legislation, like the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1948 quickly

formalized fear. McCarthyites argued that the nature of America's enemy presented them with

limited options. America was characterized as a weak nation incapable if survival without active

masculine protection. Sen. McCarthy merely continued this form of rhetoric, while focusing

most of his energies on what he claimed was the deviance within the American government

31

itself. He stressed the need for tough action against these individuals. McCarthy perpetuated the

usage of a repressive "tolerance" in his discourse, which had become a normative standard by the

mid-1950s. As time passed, rhetors faced increased limitations in their freedom to vary from the

straight and narrow path that had been constructed. Even in opposition to certain measures,

rhetors would have to concede that certain political ideologies were intolerable and that

something must be done about them. They began to differ not on the fundamental flaws of these

measures, but rather on the degree of repression.

The acceptance of the security state in the post-War U.S. powerfully affected the larger

body of American public discourse. Michael S. Sherry notes the significant role McCarthyism

played in crushing opposition to militarization. The "attitudes and practices" rounded out in this

period last today, Sherry argues.[82] The minuscule Communist Party was decimated. Labor

unions, already weakened in WWII, were made ineffectual. Federal power to investigate and

compile files surged tremendously. Michael Harrington maintains that "McCarthyism made

most people fearful of joining any organization of the Left, even the anti-Communist Left."[83]

Such a narrowing of the political continuum indicates a serious problem in American discourse.

"McCarthyism" was more than just one man's mode of conduct; it encompassed the rhetorical

patterns examined here. It involved many players who sought scapegoats for what they

determined were the real or objective international states of affairs. Legislators were a significant

portion of these agents of McCarthyism. In claiming to protect liberty and freedom, they asked

the public to accept restrictive measures. In doing this, they transformed the predominant usage

of the word "tolerance" to argue for restraint. When those in power claim strength, but their

rhetoric suggests that they rely on weak notions of democracy, debate, and liberty, they

circumvent their purpose. Tolerating dissent could not be allowed because it is feminized and thus vulnerable in a world that is masculine and physical.

"Tolerance," found in the narrative of McCarthyism, became associated with a cluster of tropes of the body that beckoned chaos. Apparently, the situation was so bad that it could not be "tolerated," "endured," "licensed," "sanctioned," "withstood," "accepted," "permitted" to exist, or "allowed" to continue. By feminizing "tolerance" and distancing it from strength, the only means left were "tough" restrictions. By associating this version of tolerance with permitting anarchy to survive unharmed within the body politic, rhetors were able to reframe themselves (and their legislation) as the agents and agencies for America's protection. "Tolerance" became set in opposition to order and stability. Freedom was endangered because of wild tolerance in a physical, not verbal, world. The world understood combat, not democratic talk. Democracy was thus relegated to a future after the world has been saved--the world must first be made safe for democracy. Once it was constructed as an evil, the only solution to this chaotic "tolerance" ironically relied upon repressive "tolerance." This transformation was only possible because "tolerance" had been associated with deviant weakness. Conformity was the code of the day, and dissent was tantamount to deviance. Hinds and Windt explain that "Americans who would dissent from the vitriolic anticommunist consensus could be banished from the prevailing political reality to the fringes of either psychological or political unreality."[84] Deviance only brought chaos. The successful linkage of deviant ideas (mind) with deviant behavior (body) fused an acceptance of repressive measures to cure this abnormality.

Such rhetorical norms, coded through metaphors to forward the ideographic cores of "freedom" and "security," undermined the possibility for serious political debate. This period's

rhetoric cemented the second half of the 20th century to Cold War patterns of debate, debate

which had few legitimate opposing sides. My perspective in retelling the McCarthyism story is

strategic. I want to draw attention to the larger phenomenon and the numerous actors helping to

form the norms of McCarthyism. Telling the McCarthyism story in this way helps to de-

naturalize the versions repeated in mass mediated discourse. When we can hear a story told

differently we can begin to rely less on conventional versions for rhetorical invention.

Opponents to McCarthyism did present seeds of the notion of a strong democracy. However

fleeting these notions were, they are important in times when democracy is chastised as the

passion of the rabble. Correspondingly, they contain the images for a re-transformation of

"tolerance" into a vivid concept used to warrant unobstructed freedom of speech.

Notes

1. Lynn Boyd Hinds and Theodore Otto Windt, Jr., <u>The Cold War as Rhetoric: The Beginnings,</u> <u>1945-1950</u> (New York: Praeger, 1991) 169.

2. Thomas B. Farrell, <u>Norms of Rhetorical Culture</u> (New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1993). Norms are patterns serving as "standards, for interpreting and appraising public advocacy as it emerges in the public forum;" they are "collaborative practices" of rhetorical action (2-3).

3. When referring to the ideograph "tolerance" I place quotation marks around the word. This distinguishes the public, rhetorical usage from the philosophical idea or ideal. The terms "tolerance" and "intolerance" have been maneuvered in public discourse throughout American history to serve competing goals, resulting in a range of meanings that implicate their future interpretations and uses. See Michael Calvin McGee, "The 'Ideograph': A Link between Rhetoric and Ideology," <u>Quarterly Journal of Speech</u> 66 (1980) 1-16, and Celeste Michelle Condit and John Louis Lucaites <u>Crafting Equality: America's Anglo-African Word</u> (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1993). Also see Michael Osborn, "Archetypal Metaphor in Rhetoric: The Light-Dark Family," <u>Quarterly Journal of Speech</u> 53 (1967) 126; Robert L. Ivie, "Metaphor and the Rhetorical Invention of Cold War 'Idealists,'" <u>Communication Monographs</u> 54 (1987): 166-67; and Ivie, "Cold War Motives and the Rhetorical Metaphor: a Framework of Criticism" <u>Cold War</u> <u>Rhetoric</u> 74.

4. Rebecca M. Townsend, "The Transformation of 'Tolerance" in the Age of McCarthyism: A Case of Problematic Rhetorical Remembrance" thesis, Indiana U, 1997. In my thesis, I demonstrated the usage of "tolerance" prior to the late 1940s and early 1950s. I showed, primarily through Supreme Court decisions and dissents of the 1910s and 1920s, that "tolerance" authorized the protection of speech. The basis for contemporary first amendment doctrine found their roots in such discourse.

5. The earliest inquiries into McCarthyism were in the 1950s. They focus their consideration primarily on Senator McCarthy and his tactics. See Barnet Baskerville, "Joe McCarthy, Brief-Case Demagogue," <u>Communication Quarterly</u> 2 (1954): 8-15; Frederick W. Haberman, Jonathan W. Curvin, Benjamin Wham, Ordean G. Ness, Orville A. Hitchcock, and Ben Park, "Views on the Army-McCarthy Hearings," <u>Quarterly Journal of Speech</u> 41 (1955): 1-18; Baskerville, "The Illusion of Proof," <u>Western Journal of Communication</u> 25 (1961): 236-42; Anthony Hillbruner, "A Night On Bald Mountain Or Variations On A Theme By McCarthy," <u>Communication Quarterly</u> 10 (1962): 1-4; Craig R. Smith, "Zeal as a Function of Danger," <u>Communication Quarterly</u> 16 (1968): 29-31; Michael D. Murray, "Persuasive Dimensions of <u>See</u> <u>It Now</u>'s "Report on Senator Joseph R. McCarthy"" <u>Communication Quarterly</u> 23 (1975): 13-20. For more recent studies on McCarthy, see James Darsey, "Joe McCarthy's Fantastic Moment," <u>Communication Monographs</u> 62 (1995): 65-86; Thomas Rosteck's "Irony, Argument, and Reportage in Television Documentary: <u>See It Now</u> Versus Senator McCarthy" <u>The Quarterly</u> <u>Journal of Speech</u> 75 (1989): 277-98; Robert L. Ivie, "Diffusing Cold War Demagoguery: Murrow vs. McCarthy" Martin J. Medhurst, Robert L. Ivie, Philip Wander, and Robert L. Scott,

<u>Cold War Rhetoric</u> 81-101. Hans-Martin Sass offers a philosophical examination of "tolerance." Hans-Martin Sass, "Ideational Politics and the Word tolerance," <u>Philosophy and Rhetoric</u>, 11 (1978) 98-113.

6. Marcuse 85-115.

7. Philip Wander, "Political Rhetoric and the Un-American Tradition," <u>Cold War Rhetoric</u>, 185-200; and Robert P. Newman, "Lethal Rhetoric: The Selling of the China Myths," <u>Quarterly Journal of Speech</u> 61 (1975):113-28.

8. Wander 197.

9. Newman 128.

10. Newman 128.

11. My use of the term "McCarthyism" in the present context is intended to specify the rhetorical phenomenon which includes stigmatizing of private as well as public citizens as traitors to their country. McCarthyism ascribed guilt to the holding of certain ideas and to association with those who held unpopular beliefs. It branded those in academia, media, entertainment and the arts, civil service, and labor. This mass-mediated, government-sponsored, scapegoating under the guise of "freedom," "necessity," and "security," used Senate and House investigatory subcommittees to exterminate opinions judged to be "un-American." It is not solely the rhetoric of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, but a larger, more complex phenomenon.

12. Farrell 1.

13. Farrell 281. Farrell usefully defines culture "as the *common definition of places for the invention and perpetuation of meaning.* A culture offers to those who live in it symbols and families of practices that permit ongoing performances of meaning and value" (277).

14. Robert Ivie, "The Ideology of Freedom's 'Fragility' in American Foreign Policy Argument," <u>Journal of the American Forensic Association</u> 24 (1987): 33.

15. Edwin Black, "The Second Persona," <u>Quarterly Journal of Speech</u>. 56 (1970): 109-119. Robert Ivie, "Realism Masking Fear: George F. Kennan's Political Rhetoric," <u>Post-Realism: The Rhetorical Turn in International Relations</u>, eds. Francis A. Beer and Robert Hariman (East Lansing, MI: Michigan State U P, 1996) 55-74.

16. Robert Ivie, "Diffusing Cold War Demagoguery: Murrow vs. McCarthy," in Martin J. Medhurst, et al., <u>Cold War Rhetoric: Strategy, Metaphor, and Ideology</u>, (New York: Greenwood, 1990) 81-101.

17. David Campbell, <u>Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity</u> (Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1992) 248-256.

18. Campbell 86.

19. Campbell 87.

20. Edward Said, <u>Culture and Imperialism</u> (New York: Vintage, 1994) 325.

21. Linda H. Kerber, "Separate Spheres, Female Worlds, Woman's Place: The Rhetoric of Women's History," <u>Journal of American History</u> 75 (1988): 39.

22. Robert Ivie, "The Democratic Imagination in a Republic of Fear: A Response to Stephen E. Lucas on America's Rhetorical Imagination," Fifth Biennial Public Address Conf., U of Illinois, 27 Sept. 1996: 8.

23. Ivie, "Democratic Imagination" 11. An *arbiter elegantiarum* is a person who prescribes, rules on, or is a recognized authority on matters of social behavior and tact.

24. Cedric Belfrage, <u>The American Inquisition, 1945-1960: A Profile of the "McCarthy Era"</u> (New York: Thunder's Mouth, 1989).

25. <u>Cong. Rec.</u> 22 Apr. 1947: 3806-7.

26. <u>Cong. Rec.</u> 22 Apr. 1947: 3808-10.

27. See Black, "The Second Persona." Black notes the implications of using imagery that portrays such a fundamental threat to the national body.

28. <u>Cong. Rec.</u> 22 Apr. 1947: 3814.

29. <u>Cong. Rec.</u> 22 Apr. 1947: 3815.

30. Karl E. Mundt, "Why the Communist Party Should Be Restrained," <u>Cong Rec.</u> 9 Apr. 1947: A1580-1.

31. <u>Cong. Rec.</u> 22 Apr. 1947: 3816-7.

32. <u>Cong. Rec.</u> 22 Apr. 1947: 3819.

33. <u>Cong. Rec.</u> 22 Apr. 1947: 3817.

34. <u>Cong. Rec.</u> 22 Apr. 1947: 3819.

35. <u>Cong. Rec.</u> 22 Apr. 1947: 3819-20.

36. <u>Cong. Rec.</u> 22 Apr. 1947: 3820.

37. Noah Mason, "The Red Menace," <u>Cong. Rec.</u> 24 Feb. 1947: A685.

38. <u>Cong. Rec.</u> 6 May 1947: 4637.

39. Alan Nadel, <u>Containment Culture: American Narratives, Postmodernism, and the Atomic Age</u> (Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1995) 298. I would also add the term "masculine" to Nadel's list of characteristics, since masculinity was a rhetorical assumption in much of Cold War discourse.

40. <u>Cong. Rec.</u> 7 May 1947: 4688.

41. Tom Englehardt, <u>The End of Victory Culture: Cold War America and the Disillusioning of a Generation</u> (New York: Basic Books, 1995) 100.

42. <u>Cong. Rec.</u> 2 Dec. 1947: 10999.

43. John E. Rankin, "Communism--Address by J. Edgar Hoover," <u>Cong. Rec.</u> 7 Jan. 1947: A27. Hoover's Address was made 30 Sept. 1946 at the Annual Convention of the American Legion, San Francisco, CA.

44. <u>Cong. Rec.</u> 7 Jan. 1947: A28.

45. <u>Cong. Rec.</u> 19 May 1948: 6148-9.

46. <u>Cong. Rec.</u> 14 May 1948: 5848.

47. <u>Cong. Rec.</u> 14 May 1948: 5864.

48. <u>Cong. Rec.</u> 14 May 1948: 5865.

49. <u>Cong. Rec.</u> 14 May 1948: 5850.

50. <u>Cong. Rec.</u> 19 May 1948: 6118.

51. <u>Cong. Rec.</u> 19 May 1948: 6128.

52. <u>Cong. Rec.</u> 19 May 1948: 6135.

53. <u>Cong. Rec.</u> 18 May 1948: 6028.

54. <u>Cong. Rec.</u> 19 May 1948: 6118.

55. <u>Cong. Rec.</u> 14 May 1948: 5850.

56. <u>Cong. Rec.</u> 18 May 1948: 6022.

57. <u>Cong. Rec.</u> 14 May 1948: 5882.

58. <u>Cong. Rec.</u> 14 May 1948: 5851.

59. Cong. Rec. 14 May 1948: 5859-60.

60. Cong. Rec. 14 May 1948: 5852-3.

61. Cong. Rec. 18 May 1948: 6022.

62. Cong. Rec. 14 May 1948: 5860.

63. Cong. Rec. 14 May 1948: 5863.

64. Cong. Rec. 14 May 1948: 5849-50.

65. Cong. Rec. 19 May 1948: 6115.

66. Cong. Rec. 14 May 1948: 5850.

67. Cong. Rec. 14 May 1948: 5857.

68. Cong. Rec. 18 May 1948: 6027.

69. Cong. Rec. 5 Sept. 1950: 14169.

70. Joseph McCarthy, "February 20, 1950: First Speech Delivered in Senate by Senator Joe McCarthy on Communists in Government; Wheeling Speech," Congressional Record: Major Speeches and Debates of Senator Joe McCarthy Delivered in the United States Senate, 1950-51 (reprint from Cong. Rec., New York: Gordon, 1975) 7.

71. McCarthy, "February 20, 1950" 5.

72. McCarthy, "February 20, 1950" 6-17.

73. McCarthy, "February 20, 1950" 17.

74. Said 324.

75. McCarthy, "February 20, 1950" 22-60.

76. McCarthy, "February 20, 1950" 32.

77. McCarthy, "February 20, 1950" 34-43.

78. Joseph McCarthy, "March 30, 1950, Information on Lattimore, Jessup, Service, and Hanson Cases," Congressional Record: Major Speeches and Debates 66.

79. McCarthy, "March 30, 1950" 123.

80. Ivie, "Diffusing Cold War Demagoguery."

81. Ivie, "Diffusing Cold War Demagoguery" 89.

82. Michael S. Sherry, <u>In the Shadow of War: The United States Since the 1930s</u> (New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1995) 171-177.

83. Michael Harrington, <u>Toward A Democratic Left: A Radical Program for a New Majority</u> (New York: MacMillan, 1968) 267.

84. Hinds and Windt 176-177.

Works Cited

Baskerville, Barnet. "Joe McCarthy, Brief-Case Demagogue." Communication
    Quarterly 2 (1954): 8-15.
---. "The Illusion of Proof." Western Journal of Communication 25 (1961): 236-42.
Belfrage, Cedric. The American Inquisition, 1945-1960: A Profile of the "McCarthy Era". New
    York: Thunder's Mouth, 1989.
Black, Edwin. "The Second Persona." Quarterly Journal of Speech. 56 (1970): 109-119.
Campbell, David. Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of
    Identity. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1992.
Condit, Celeste Michelle and John Louis Lucaites. Crafting Equality: America's Anglo-
    African Word. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1993.
Cong. Rec. 22 Apr. 1947: 3806-7, 3808-10, 3814, 3815, 3816-7, 3819-20.
---. 6 May 1947: 4637.
---. 7 May 1947: 4688.
---. 2 Dec. 1947: 10999.
---. 7 Jan. 1947: A28.
---. 19 May 1948: 6148-9.
---. 14 May 1948: 5848, 5849-50, 5852-3, 5857, 5859-60, 5863, 5864, 5865, 5851, 5852.
---. 18 May 1948: 6022, 6027, 6028.
---. 19 May 1948: 6115, 6118, 6128, 6135.
---. 5 Sept. 1950: 14169.
Darsey, James. "Joe McCarthy's Fantastic Moment." Communication Monographs 62 (1995):
    65-86.
Englehardt, Tom. The End of Victory Culture: Cold War America and the Disillusioning of a
    Generation. New York: Basic Books, 1995.
Farrell, Thomas B. Norms of Rhetorical Culture. New Haven, CT: Yale U P, 1993.
Haberman, Frederick W., Jonathan W. Curvin, Benjamin Wham, Ordean G. Ness, Orville A.
    Hitchcock, and Ben Park. "Views on the Army-McCarthy Hearings." Quarterly Journal
    of Speech 41 (1955): 1-18.
Hillbruner, Anthony. "A Night On Bald Mountain Or Variations On A Theme By McCarthy."
    Communication Quarterly 10 (1962): 1-4.
Hinds, Lynn Boyd and Theodore Otto Windt, Jr. The Cold War as Rhetoric: The Beginnings,
    1945-1950. New York: Praeger, 1991.
Ivie, Robert L. "Cold War Motives and the Rhetorical Metaphor: a Framework of Criticism."
    Cold War Rhetoric: Strategy, Metaphor, and Ideology. Martin J. Medhurst, Robert L.
    Ivie, Philip Wander, and Robert L. Scott. New York: Greenwood, 1990. 71-79.
---. "The Democratic Imagination in a Republic of Fear: A Response to Stephen E. Lucas on
    America's Rhetorical Imagination." Fifth Biennial Public Address Conf., U of Illinois,
    27 Sept. 1996: 1-12.
---. "Diffusing Cold War Demagoguery: Murrow vs. McCarthy." Cold War Rhetoric: Strategy,
    Metaphor, and Ideology. Martin J. Medhurst, Robert L. Ivie, Philip Wander, and Robert
    L. Scott. New York: Greenwood, 1990. 81-101.

---. "The Ideology of Freedom's 'Fragility' in American Foreign Policy Argument." Journal of the American Forensic Association 24 (1987): 27-36.

---. "Realism Masking Fear: George F. Kennan's Political Rhetoric." Post-Realism: The Rhetorical Turn in International Relations. Eds. Francis A. Beer and Robert Hariman. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State U P, 1996. 55-74.

---. "Metaphor and the Rhetorical Invention of Cold War 'Idealists.'" Communication Monographs 54 (1987): 166-67.

Kerber, Linda H. "Separate Spheres, Female Worlds, Woman's Place: The Rhetoric of Women's History." Journal of American History 75 (1988): 9-39.

Marcuse, Herbert. "Repressive Tolerance." Critique of Pure Tolerance. Ed. Robert Paul Wolff. Boston: Beacon, 1965. 81-117.

McCarthy, Joseph. "February 20, 1950: First Speech Delivered in Senate by Senator Joe McCarthy on Communists in Government; Wheeling Speech." 1950. Congressional Record: Major Speeches and Debates of Senator Joe McCarthy Delivered in the United States Senate, 1950-51. New York: Gordon, 1975. 5-60.

---. "March 30, 1950, Information on Lattimore, Jessup, Service, and Hanson Cases." 1950. Congressional Record: Major Speeches and Debates of Senator Joe McCarthy Delivered in the United States Senate, 1950-51. New York: Gordon, 1975. 61-123.

McGee, Michael Calvin. "The 'Ideograph': A Link between Rhetoric and Ideology." Quarterly Journal of Speech 66 (1980) 1-16.

Mundt, Karl E. "Why the Communist Party Should Be Restrained." Cong Rec. 9 Apr. 1947: A1580-1.

Murray, Michael D. "Persuasive Dimensions of See It Now's 'Report on Senator Joseph R. McCarthy.'" Communication Quarterly 23 (1975): 13-20.

Nadel, Alan. Containment Culture: American Narratives, Postmodernism, and the Atomic Age. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1995.

Newman, Robert P. "Lethal Rhetoric: The Selling of the China Myths." Quarterly Journal of Speech 61 (1975):113-28.

Osborn, Michael. "Archetypal Metaphor in Rhetoric: The Light-Dark Family." Quarterly Journal of Speech 53 (1967) 115-126.

Rankin, John E. "Communism--Address by J. Edgar Hoover." Cong. Rec. 7 Jan. 1947: A27.

Rosteck, Thomas. "Irony, Argument, and Reportage in Television Documentary: See It Now Versus Senator McCarthy." Quarterly Journal of Speech 75 (1989): 277-98.

Said, Edward. Culture and Imperialism. New York: Vintage, 1994.

Sass, Hans-Martin. "Ideational Politics and the Word Tolerance." Philosophy and Rhetoric 11 (1978) 98-113.

Sherry, Michael S. In the Shadow of War: The United States Since the 1930s. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 1995.

Smith, Craig R. "Zeal as a Function of Danger." Communication Quarterly 16 (1968): 29-31.

Townsend, Rebecca M. "The Transformation of 'Tolerance" in the Age of McCarthyism: A Case of Problematic Rhetorical Remembrance." Thesis. Indiana U, 1997.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

®
ERIC

REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: McCarthyism's Rhetorical Norms.

Author(s): Rebecca M. Townsend

Corporate Source:	Publication Date: (NCA) Nov. 22, 1997

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY ____ Sample ____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 1	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY ____ Sample ____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2A	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY ____ Sample ____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2B
Level 1 ↑ [✓]	Level 2A ↑ [ ]	Level 2B ↑ [ ]
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g.. electronic) and paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here,→ please

Signature: Rebecca M. Townsend	Printed Name/Position/Title: Rebecca M. Townsend / Ph.D. Student	
Organization/Address: Department of Communication, Machmer Hall Box 34815, University of Massachusetts Amherst, MA 01003-4815	Telephone: 413-545-1311	FAX: 413-545-6399
	E-Mail Address: townsend@comm.umass.edu	Date: 10/13/98

ERIC
Full Text Provided by ERIC

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

Acquisitions

ERIC/REC
2805 E. Tenth Street
Smith Research Center, 150
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47408

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2nd Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com