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INTRODUCTION-WHO REALLY CARES?

The second "Red Scare," of the late 1940s and early 1950s, is an oft discussed topic which is difficult to put into proper historical perspective. That is, most of the American public believes the period to have been an admittedly embarrassing segment of United States past, but one which will certainly not repeat itself. Some feel that the anti-Communist activities of Senator Joseph McCarthy and his supporters were an admirable attempt to keep the American government and mass media "clean" of disloyalists and subversives. Many younger citizens do not even realize that the hearings took place, or that Senator McCarthy ever existed. The institutionalized intolerance characteristic of this era requires constant re-evaluation because, contrary to easily accepted opinion, the country could indeed slip into another anti-Communist fervor which might inspire similar, though not necessarily so extreme, organized persecution. The mood of America is still one of hostility and mistrust toward communism.

Patriotism, political, economic, and social differences, and the omnipresent nuclear arms race continue to foster both fervent nationalism as well as continued mistrust of the Soviet Union and its idealistic supporters. The nation's mood is easily swayed by current events and the mass media of television, radio, and periodicals. The very nature of politics exhibits the power of extremism and individual influence over national trends. One person can feasibly propel himself or herself into a position of national prominence, if he or she knows a viable course, and
realizes the country's or even a local area's view toward a particular issue of controversy or concern. Joseph McCarthy was one such individual.

Some political analysts subtly imply that the McCarthy era was merely an isolated period when they cite Joseph McCarthy as "the" evil agitator, one who came to power shortly after a national period of transition to the Cold War: "The late Joseph R. McCarthy, a United States Senator from Wisconsin, was in many ways the most gifted demagogue ever bred on these shores. No bolder seditionist ever moved among us--nor any politician with a surer, swifter access to the dark places of the American mind"(Rovere, p.3). While they advise remembering the Senator and his reign, they imply that McCarthy was an anomaly, and that a similar sudden rise to power is, therefore, highly improbable. This attitude is derived from a unique faith in the American people and government, as well as the comfortable knowledge that Joseph McCarthy, representative of political intolerance, is safely out of American politics. This attitude has come about because many critics have disregarded a basic fact--this witch hunter was "just" a man.

Senator Joseph McCarthy was an insecure, politically driven, selfish individual who meticulously chose the most strategic course toward elective success. It is imperative, if we are genuinely to learn from the injustices of this period, to acknowledge the fact that McCarthy was a human being, and not merely a symbol of intolerance. I hope to trace the career and characteristics of Joseph McCarthy; to show that politics facilitates, indeed encourages, extremism. We know that there were and are numerous potential McCarthys, partially self-motivated, and partially
fostered by the nature of the American electoral process and the political atmosphere of a given period. Based on the current national psyche and historical evidence, the country could indeed face a third Red Scare of institutionalized proportion. McCarthy's rise was quick and well-organized and might conceivably be emulated by another shrewd and unconsionable individual.

One vehicle which additionally swayed national anti-Communist sentiment was the motion picture industry. Subliminal and overt messages were infused into productions which used simple plots, tense music, and highly stereotyped characterizations in order to convince the American public that an internal Communist threat existed and needed to be wholly eradicated at the grass roots level.

Political pressure and the mood of the second Red Scare era brought out the insecurities of the film industry, as these movies were produced to demonstrate national loyalty. By examining these movies, one might recognize the aspects of American values to which anti-communists were trying to appeal, as well as the resulting attitudes and frustrations of the era.

The common bond between much of the film industry and Joseph McCarthy was insecurity and the drive for national approval. If one grasps the specific characteristics of McCarthy the man, and the methods of these politically "inspired" movies, we can to better place the period into context and acknowledge the fact that, if the citizenry is not aware, and is again caught by an ever-building wave of trickle down sentiment, the 1950s might not prove to be an isolated period in American history.
Insecurity was not a fifties novelty. It still exists, and could potentially escalate anti-Communist policy and sentiment into widespread paranoia in the 1980s.
JOSEPH R. McCARTHY—THE MAN, AND HIS RISE TO POWER

In assessing Joseph McCarthy's rise to national prominence, one is tempted to delve deeply into the specifics of his later years, and even into the biographies of those who surrounded and supported the Senator from Wisconsin, because the years of anti-Communist persecution are still barely comprehensible. Here, in this post-war, transitional phase, is a definitive depiction of institutionalized intolerance in practice, in a country where freedom of belief is written into law, and touted as that which separates America from totalitarian states like the Soviet Union. But this essay is devoted mainly to the specifics of McCarthy's rise, as I hope to discover what this individual went through en route to his position of relative authority. McCarthy was, trite as it sounds, a human being—motivated by his own experiences, and driven toward a goal of popular recognition. He was not, as many analysts imply, merely a passing and inevitably beaten symbol; he was one of innumerable anti-Communists during the era. Joseph, the man, was just louder, and more willing to adopt and to defend "the cause," regardless of truth or human dignity.

The late Roy Cohn, lawyer, and assistant to McCarthy in the latter part of the Senator's career, recently stated: "I think McCarthy performed a substantial service to the country by alerting the country to the menace of communism when most people in this country were not tuned into how deadly it was. . . ."¹ Said political analysts William F. Buckley Jr. and L. Brent Bozell, before McCarthy's imminent demise was realized, "We believe that in McCarthyism hang the hopes of America for effective
resistance to Communist infiltration. And if and when McCarthy broadens out, and there have been indications that he will, his spirit may infuse American foreign policy with the sinews and purpose to crush the Communist conspiracy. Only then can we afford to do without McCarthy.\textsuperscript{2}

How did this small town Wisconsin resident accumulate such committed and staunch support for his personal integrity, as well as his national quest?

\textbf{The Youth}

There are conflicting opinions as to what McCarthy's childhood, which was lived out in the small Wisconsin village of Grand Chute during the 1910s and 1920s, was like. Many argue that he was a "mother's boy," with a poor relationship with his father and brothers. But interviews with neighbors seem to conclude otherwise: "The McCarthys were very close,' says Jim Heenan, a retired Grand Chute farmer who lived adjacent to [the McCarthy] spread. 'They always looked out for each other. All this stuff about Joe's feuding with his father and his brothers is a lot of bunk. I know. I was there.'\textsuperscript{3} In fact, there is evidence that Joe was his father's particular favorite, because he worked longer hours on the family farm than his siblings. The boys did sometimes get involved in fist fights, 

"[b]ut that was the way differences among children were generally settled in Grand Chute."\textsuperscript{4}

Joe quit school at fourteen to help work the land full time; at sixteen
he started his own business selling chickens. He was nervous, eager to work, and unable to sit still or sleep for very long.\textsuperscript{5} McCarthy had direction, and he moved toward it from the very beginning of his life. He wanted to be an active shaper; he was ambitious. When Joe eventually attended college (Marquette University), he pushed himself, both academically, as well as outside of the scholarly realm. McCarthy pledged Delta Theta Phi, the law fraternity, where he made numerous friends. He held down many jobs, washing dishes, running elevators, parking cars, cooking, and coaching boxers. He even won a tire selling contest while managing a Standard Oil service station.\textsuperscript{6}

Joe was also a gambler, playing poker at extremely high stakes, so that he could bluff his opponents out with large wagers. He would arm wrestle for money, and even boxed at the University with a brawling, powerhouse style. He was a tough, rugged, competitive individual, eager to succeed in each separate endeavor.\textsuperscript{7} This would later prove to be his political style. He would oftentimes bluff those who questioned his accusations, and he was always ready to battle his most formidable adversaries. He was a scrapper.

The Worker

Joe graduated from law school in 1935, and began a practice in Waupaca, a tiny county near his home town. Again, McCarthy was industrious and committed to the task of completing his business. He
would take divorce cases which were ignored by other lawyers because they were controversial, and might stir up the town.\textsuperscript{8} He would also leave his office lights on all night, to make the citizenry think that he was always working.\textsuperscript{9} McCarthy was painstakingly building himself an image which would show that he was sincere and persistent in his legal endeavors.

Joe joined the Democratic Party, mainly because Waupaca was dominated by the GOP, and he wanted to make his mark as an independent and fearless thinker. He joined the local softball league and the Junior League of Commerce, sold tickets for the President’s Birthday Ball Against Polio, and chaired the Lion’s Club Harvest Day Committee.\textsuperscript{10} Joe was also meticulously creating a public perception of his supposed idealism.

In 1936, Mike Eberlein, a well-known lawyer, offered McCarthy a law partnership in Shawano, a nearby county. Joe eagerly accepted and balanced the conservative Eberlein well with his hard work and New Deal mentality.\textsuperscript{11} Joe immediately became familiar with the residents and rose to the top of the local Democratic party, which was weak in Shawano. McCarthy delivered lectures to numerous clubs; soon he was treasurer of the local Democratic Party, chairman of the Young Democrats of the Seventh Congressional District, and an eager fund-raiser for FDR.\textsuperscript{12} Then, Joe made his first radical political step--he announced his candidacy for district attorney.\textsuperscript{13}

Joe's platform was simple: he wanted to make the position of district attorney a part-time job and cut the salary in half. Joe implied that his opponent, the incumbent Louis Cattau, held down a second job while
executing his elected tasks, and that this somehow showed that there was not much legal work to be done. The fact that Cattau worked at a second position was true, but it was merely acting as Shawano County Fair secretary for $40 a month.\textsuperscript{14} McCarthy had conveyed slanted information to the public. Although he had only entered the race for the sake of gaining experience and widened exposure, as he knew that victory was impossible, Joe was still crude and entirely unsympathetic to the reputation or integrity of the opponent. McCarthy was soundly defeated in the race.

In 1939, McCarthy announced that he would run for the circuit court judgeship. Clearly, he was out to win a political contest and to begin his elective career. Joe's declaration caused a serious rift between McCarthy and his law partner, because Eberlein was also planning to run. Joe would often say: "You know, Mike has one of the finest legal minds in the state. But he's probably the world's worst politician."\textsuperscript{15} McCarthy later resolved the conflict as a Senator, when he helped Eberlein gain the circuit court judgeship.\textsuperscript{16} Still, this early race exhibits Joe's extreme political drive, as well as the lengths to which he was willing to stretch in order to achieve public office; friendship was not relevant. It also reflected the techniques which many politicians exhibited during elections. The primary difference was that Joe wished to remain friends after the contest was over--an insecure political trait which he carried to his death:

"The point here is not that McCarthy was often a concerned and loving fellow, but that he was capable of being unscrupulous yet loyal, cruel yet understanding, destructive yet generous to the same
people, without showing a conscious sense of personal confusion. He seemed consumed by two conflicting forces: a frightening drive for recognition and for advancement, and a compulsive need to be liked, to be a "good fellow."  

McCarthy's Style: Political Hypocrisy

Joseph McCarthy's political ideologies and practices can be summarized in one word: fraud. Joe began his hierarchical climb with a meager law practice and did not stop until he reached the status of Congressional inquisitor. He defeated Shawano circuit court judge Edgar Werner by implying that his competitor was seventy-three, and therefore too old to deliberate effectively (he was actually sixty-seven), and by ranting about the amassed salary of the incumbent ($170,000-200,000), which was actually a meager sum, when divided over his three decade career. Joe's methodology featured deception and flowery promises. However, he was always a diligent worker. Once elected judge, McCarthy became known for his expedient disposal of cases. He cleared a backlog of 250 pending decisions and held extremely short proceedings.

With the advent of World War II, Joe decided, although his position exempted him from service, to join the United States Marines. McCarthy realized that service was a necessary stepping stone to higher office, and a must for an up-and-coming politician's resume. He served ably as an intelligence officer and procurer of goods at Bougainville; however, he saw to it that over-inflated stories about his military service career filtered
back to the States, in order to build a more impressive public standing for himself: "In 1944, he spoke of fourteen bombing missions; in 1947 these figures rose to seventeen; in 1951 it peaked at thirty-two. He requested--and received--an Air Medal, four stars, and the Distinguished Flying Cross, awarded for twenty-five missions in combat."21

McCarthy's run for the U.S. Senate in 1946 was a complex and lengthy process, but it is best encapsulated in the following three events. First, he changed his party membership to the GOP (No one is exactly sure when, although most feel that it was after his 1936 defeat in the race for district attorney).23 Secondly, he made a bid for the Senate in 1944, while still stationed overseas. His odds were slim; but again, he gained exposure and acquired constituents through his campaign of and for the people. He promised "job security for every man and woman" and "lasting peace throughout the world."24 These were impossible goals, but they expressed the image which McCarthy felt would gain him a following. And a following he did receive, as the Committee to Elect Joseph McCarthy U.S. Senator was formed.25 Still, he lost the race.

McCarthy inevitably achieved victory in his second attempt through devious and exhaustive means: "The campaign had a curiously manic air about it, dominated by a figure who would say anything, threaten anyone, go anywhere to achieve his objective."26 McCarthy caused one GOP rival, Walter Kohler Jr., to pull out of the race or face public exposure of his divorce (a taboo, at the time).27 He also "outbluffed" Tom Coleman, the local Republican Party boss and staunch anti-Democrat, by stating that he (McCarthy) should receive the GOP nomination over "hard-drinking"
ex-governor Julius Heil because he was the strongest candidate, and because the Republicans would stand less of a winning chance if they had to face a three-way race.28

Ironically, McCarthy's inevitable victory over Democratic incumbent Bob LaFolette was helped by the Communist Party: "The Communists 'were out for La Folette's hide...and the exhaust explosion of their negativism blew Joe...right into the United States Senate.29 Bob had not supported Stalin's expansionist policies, and this disturbed the Communist-dominated CIO. McCarthy's stance varied according to his audience: "For virulent anti-Communists, he related a sordid tale of 'American appeasement in foreign affairs.' But for Soviet sympathizers, he offered a different line: 'I do not subscribe to the theory that a war with the Russians is inevitable. . . . Stalin's proposal for world disarmament is a great thing and he must be given credit for being sincere about it.'"30 Thus McCarthy was willing to alter his philosophies for the sake of political support.

Once in Washington, Joe showed himself to be a hometown boy in a bustling and socially conscious city: "The thing to remember," said one Washington reporter who knew him, "is that he [was] a country bumpkin--a smalltown, would-be bigshot who made it. He [was] ignorant, crude, boastful, unaware of either intellectual or social refinements." According to historian David Oshinsky, "[h]is interests were narrow and self-centered. When not working, he gambled, chased women, talked politics, and watched Westerns."31 More personally, McCarthy felt out of place and unhappy with his new environment. He was a tough ex-Marine in
the midst of intellectuals and easy talkers. "Their strengths were obviously his weaknesses."\(^{32}\)

Certainly Joe had a warm side. He was a caring friend during the Christmas season, sharing Yuletide gifts with local building workers; and he would readily donate twenty dollars to the subject of a hard-luck story.\(^{33}\) Thus, he was not the embodiment of pure evil, as some analysts might like to think.

McCarthy looked for an issue around which he could center his attention and gain supporters. At first, he chose to defend the rights of American veterans. But this tactic fell through when the vets realized that Joe's efforts fell short of sincerity and feasibility, and were mainly political stunts (he would appeal for free housing for all crippled veterans after wheeling a paraplegic into the Senate anteroom). Joe was not really for social-welfare programs, as these were generally opposed by the Republican Party.\(^{34}\)

In 1944, 49.2% of the American public felt that "[i]t is important to be on friendly terms [with the Soviet Union]. . . but not so important we should make too many concessions to her."\(^{35}\) Anti-Communism was even then heating up as a potentially volatile national sentiment. In 1950, McCarthy sought an issue which would guarantee him reelection. On January 7, he dined with Father Edmund Walsh, dean of Georgetown's School of Foreign Relations, Charles Kraus, a political science instructor at Georgetown, and William Roberts, a Washington attorney.\(^{36}\) According to legend, Walsh held Communism to be a favorite issue, and said: "The government is full of Communists. The thing to do is hammer at them."\(^{37}\)
McCarthy grasped the issue as if it were his own newborn infant and held on to it until his inevitable demise.

In February, McCarthy prepared a speech, and delivered it to the Ohio County Women's Republican Club in Wheeling West Virginia. He stated that he held a list of 205 members of the Communist Party (the number he actually stated is unknown, as the speech was not taped, and opinions conflict) who were currently employed by the U.S. government. With the speech began the most concerted effort to weed out supposed governmental and other institutional subversives in American history. Hysteria set firmly in the psyches of the U.S. populous.

A Congressional committee was formed to examine the McCarthy accusations. Little evidence was necessary for a subpoena to be issued, as the Democratic controlled committee looked to make quick work of the controversy and quell McCarthy's impending storm. It could not because of a national paranoia generated by the McCarthy style. In the Senate hearings, headed by Maryland's Democratic conservative senior senator Millard Tydings (the Democrats' strategic choice), Joe would embellish the facts in order to incite suspicion. One suspect went from "inclined toward Communist" to "a Communist"; a typist at the Soviet embassy was referred to as "an assistant editor"; one "friend of someone believed to be a Communist" was suddenly "a close pal of a known Communist." Joe received most information from a "network of right-wing propagandists who had been pushing his line for almost twenty years." He also had the initial backing of a somewhat dubious Republican Party, which was riding the issue out to see what it would yield. Joe would
hedge and throw the Tydings Committee off with flowery rhetoric and stall tactics. When searching for a book (written by Haldore Hanson, a State Department Administrator) which dealt with Chinese Communism in 1939, and which McCarthy equated with Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, the junior senator from Wisconsin admitted that he could not even remember the name of the work. He then looked through some papers and gave an inaccurate title. Throughout the hearing, McCarthy misquoted the work. This was his method— to incriminate, no matter what the truth.

For McCarthy, the entire ordeal was like a game: "Another habit," a newsman recalled, 'was his tapping the mouthpiece of his telephone with a pencil. This was supposed to frustrate any bugs planted in his phone. Knowing Joe McCarthy, I concluded that this was not paranoia, but sheer childish delight in playing spy games." And Joe never regretted the fabrications and demeaning persecution. He was chiefly concerned with his own pleasure and gain, because he was too insecure with himself to appreciate the misery of others: "The senator did not apologize. 'In all the years I knew him,' according to Urban Van Susteren, 'he never said "I'm sorry." He might act sorry or try to make amends in other ways. But he could never utter those words.' Instead, McCarthy tried to 'clarify' his remarks." Unwilling to damage his public image for the sake of human dignity, Joe McCarthy could not face the career-affecting possibility that he could be wrong. Rather, he covered his ground and assumed infallibility.
Opposition, Support, and The Press

When McCarthy initiated his anti-Communist efforts, he was immediately and staunchly supported by the right-wing press, including the Hearst and McCormick chains, and political commentators like Walter Winchell, George Sokolsky, Westbrook Pegler, and H.V. Kaltenborn. But the opposition was even stronger. The Senator was publicly chastised by organized labor, the educational establishment, and organized religion. He was also attacked by popular journals, including each of the country's "ten best dailies" and most major news magazines. Most reporters at these periodicals refused to believe that the government had been dangerously infiltrated by Communists; and they mainly supported moderate viewpoints and bipartisanship. McCarthy had to overcome this force, and so he employed his most effective skill—intimidation. Joe would subtly imply that he might use his position in order to cause inconveniences and unpleasantries for a vocal critic. "He used to call regularly," said one reporter of McCarthy. "...He'd kid me about my sources, or some minor point that I had made that he said was wrong. . . . He just wanted me to know he was watching." The press could not choose to ignore McCarthy, as he was significant news, and required print. "[McCarthy] was a master at using the media. He knew when to release information in order to get maximum publicity and effect." McCarthy also benefitted from his extensive television exposure, as his rhetoric carried well over the air waves. Thus, McCarthy turned the potential
hazard of open criticism to his own political advantage.

The Causes

Many factors contributed to the anti-Communist surge of the forties and fifties. Traditional Americans mistrusted anything which potentially jeopardized capitalism, democracy, and Christianity.\(^51\) Most people were also grossly unfamiliar with the ideologies of the twentieth century: "many Americans knew very little about the capitalism and democracy they held so dear, wrongly viewed communism and socialism as synonymous isms, saw liberalism as an alien ideology that was little different from socialism and communism, and were willing to suspend basic civil rights and liberties in the battle against a highly overrated communist threat."\(^52\) The insecure sentiments were also due, in large part, to American skepticism about the Soviet Union's capability to build their own atomic bomb. Many believed that Russia could only have acquired such knowledge from Western sources.\(^53\) Thus, in many respects, McCarthy was merely an offspring of this sentiment, ready and eager to voice his disapproval and inner fear.

Certain historical occurrences also fueled the McCarthyist fire. Many Americans equated Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal and his relatively close ties to the Soviet Union to be a sign that socialist and communist subversion had infiltrated the U.S. government. These Americans felt that ever since the Democrats had gained power in 1933, and particularly after
the wartime conferences, which were intended to determine Allied strategies and divide post-war territories, that America was subject to Communist infiltration and eventual domination. As a result, as early as 1938, Congress had formed the House Un-American Activities Committee, or HUAC, to investigate alleged subversive activities and individuals.

Equally disturbing in the years after World War II was Communism's persistent growth from behind the Iron Curtain to North Korea, China, and Indochina; Stalin threatened Middle Eastern countries and could potentially have incited a war over the Berlin blockade. Spy rings were discovered in Canada, Britain, and the United States. As a result, in 1947, HUAC strengthened its investigations by interrogating members of labor unions, government, education, and the film industry.

In addition, certain laws had been enacted to combat the potential Communist threat. First, in 1939, came the Hatch Act, which barred government workers from belonging to "any political party or organization which advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government." Then, in 1940, Congress voted the Alien Registration or Smith Act into law. This "forbade all Americans to knowingly or willfully advocate, abet, advise, or teach the duty, necessity, desirability or propriety of overthrowing or destroying any government in the United States by force or violence." In 1943, the Supreme Court affirmed in the Schneiderman case "that mere membership in the Communist Party is insufficient proof that a given individual advocates the violent overthrow of the government." And yet, more often than not, Party affiliation was
enough to confirm disloyalty and cause official suspicion and subpoena.

Finally, the Internal Security Act of 1950, which demanded "the federal registration of ill-defined 'Communist-action' groups and their members [who were then denied passports and the right to work in defense related industries]. . . . And it provided for concentration camps to detain subversives 'in time of national emergency."60 This act meant that belief, and not necessarily action, was now the rule of thumb which could allow the denial of "admission to (or) deportation from" the United States.61

Thus, Joseph McCarthy had plenty of legal activity, as well as significant support from the Republican Party, which hoped to oust the Democrats from both executive and Congressional power. And so it was that in 1950, Maine Senator Margaret Chase Smith, the only woman elected to the Senate at that time, summarized the dilemma, but went chiefly unheard, as her voice was drowned out by feverish and wholly misdirected nationalism. She said: "Those of us who shout the loudest about Americanism...are all too frequently those who, by our own words and acts, ignore some of the basic principles of Americanism:

The right to criticize;
The right to hold unpopular beliefs;
The right to protest;
The right of independent thought."62

Smith ended her speech by stating: "As an American, I want to see our nation recapture the strength and unity it once had when we fought the enemy instead of ourselves."63 Smith pointed out the problems of
anti-Communist persecution, but her speech did not bring about its
deserved demise, because the movement of intolerance was too firmly and
steadfastly backed by insecure citizens and Republicans vying for power.
Most Democrats were slow to attack the real problem of intolerance, as
they were preoccupied with keeping the public satisfied (requiring
professions of anti-Communism) and merely fighting McCarthy’s
disrespectful, inaccurate, and incongruous style. It was not as much a
fight between camps of “pro-freedom of political beliefers” and
“anti-Communists,” as it was a battle between “anti-Communists” and
“anti-McCarthyites.” Thus, the American political system allowed
intolerance to reign, as individuals worked for the ascendancy of their
party and less for the basic intellectual freedoms of American citizens.
The Democrats mapped out strategies to counter the McCarthy and
Republican influence, rather than addressing the direct issue. Both major
American political parties were guilty of spewing slanderous rhetoric
about the opposition, and not defending liberties guaranteed by the
Constitution.

The Man-- In Summary

In a chapter of his book, which attempts to explain and evaluate the
anti-Communist movement, Senator McCarthy answers questions (which he
poses of himself) about his official motives and subsequent actions. In one
response, he states:
I suggest to you, therefore, that when a politician mounts the speaker's rostrum and makes the statement that he 'agrees with McCarthy's aims but not his methods,' that you ask him what methods he himself has used against Communists. I suggest you ask him to name a single Communist or camp follower that he has forced out of the government by his methods.

I do not much mind the Communists screaming about my methods. That is their duty as Communists. They are under orders to do just that. But it makes me ill deep down inside when I hear cowardly politicians and self-proclaimed 'liberals,' too lazy to do their own thinking, parrot over and over this Communist Party line. By constant repetition they deceive good, loyal Americans into believing that there is some easy, delicate way of exposing Communists without at the same time exposing all of their traitorous, sordid acts.64

It is this rhetoric which typifies McCarthy. The Senator defends himself by switching the blame for wrongdoing to the opposition. That is, McCarthy never directly responds to his critics, but instead mentions those unpatriotic Americans who choose to condemn him and/or his methods, rather than join the fight for national liberation from internal disloyalists. He also defends his actions by stating that because little else has been achieved in the way of flushing out American Communists, his strategies are therefore justified, and indeed, admirable. McCarthy managed to avoid the issue of his own culpability through this defensive jargon and verbally abusive propaganda.

Joseph McCarthy was an insecure individual who grabbed hold of a volatile issue and rode it through a career of deliberate inaccuracies and
outright falsehoods directed against a mistrusted minority. The fact that he was persecuting innocent Americans whose beliefs were not illegal was barely an issue, as the Senator was sanctioned by extensive Congressional legislation. He did not want to make enemies, ("McCarthy is easy to get along with, when you agree with him. To me, as to others, he was just plain 'Joe.' He felt hurt if you called him Senator McCarthy or by any formal name.")\textsuperscript{65}, but resolved himself to the fact that his standpoint would not be universally supported. And so, he at once attempted to maintain a familiar rapport with some members of the Democratic opposition, while at the same time accusing others of subversive activities and membership in the Communist Party.

McCarthy knew that he wanted to enter politics from youth, and so he arranged his life and his experiences to place him into a position of recognition. He was a fighter (literally and figuratively), a motivated worker, an expedient judge, a "combat" Marine, and a ruthless politician. He had both financial and psychological woes, as he habitually gambled (again, literally and figuratively) for a better situation. McCarthy certainly thought that he was doing the country a great service; but surely, this was a superficial attitude (as he adopted the viewpoint as a political maneuver). "Had the circumstances been different, he could just as easily have ridden the fears of a fascist, Jewish, or black 'menace' to the top of the glory pole. He was a man without principles, scruples, beliefs, or proof of his sensational allegations.\textsuperscript{66} All of these positions and actions stemmed from the man's insecure desire to be publicly recognized and admired. They were not merely the characteristics of a national symbol;
they were the insecure motivations of a selfishly driven, paranoid, and unconscionable human being.
REFLECTIONS

The film industry, in its response to anti-Communist persecution, also exhibited insecurity, as it produced wholly slanted movies which were intended to instill a fear of the "Red Menace." Some film makers viewed the request to produce such pictures as a loyalty test. If a person were willing to work on an anti-Communist picture, either in front of or behind the camera, then he/she considered himself/herself safe from political condemnation. Between 1947 and 1954, fifty such films were created. Their budgets were low, as studio executives did not predict favorable earnings. Thus, lesser known actors were customarily the featured performers.¹

These films were unpleasant for the film companies, not because of their particular political stance, but rather because they expressed any ideology at all. Competition from the television industry was causing financial worries, and political films were a known risk.² In the fall of 1949, Variety wrote: "the public will buy message pix, but they gotta be good." Anti-Communist films were typically unpopular, and so they were oftentimes slated as second features on double bills in order to guarantee an audience.³ Historians generally conclude that the films were directed toward a "uniformed audience" as an "appeasement" to government scrutinizers, and a strategic form of public relations.⁴

The anti-Communist productions were psychologically manipulative. Subliminal messages, emotion-tapping dialogue, tense and carefully infused music, and visual symbols all worked to coerce the audience to a
specific resolve. When these films are carefully analyzed, we can easily see how audiences could be convinced of an impending threat. Closer inspection, however, reveals the simplicity and misinformation which were used to achieve the desired ends. These productions appealed to base reaction, not thoughtful consideration. They were directed toward the emotional insecurity of the viewer, and not intended to evoke intellectual, or internationally sympathetic, thought processes. Excepting the leftist pro-civil liberties films which concluded the era, they were meant to create fervent, unflinching, trusting patriotism.

The plots of these mass produced dramatic commentaries varied, but the theme was always the same: Communism is the chief threat to all that is wholesome and worthwhile in America. Subsequent advice was also delivered fairly consistently: trust only that which is genuine and familiar; be prepared to "condemn those whose 'loyalty' [is] in question." 5

Stereotyping is the chief method of swaying popular opinion in these productions. While the integrity of some characters remains in question for a considerable period of time, confirmed Communist Party members, and those whom the viewer eventually discovers are Communist, have specific, "unpleasant" features and character traits. The audience is suspicious of these individuals from the outset of the film. As they gradually come to realize that their suspicions are correct, they come to believe that, at least in these political films, those who look evil are evil. Thus, the audience can leave the theater confident of their own "spy hunting" capabilities. In life, they are to trust that which is familiar and aesthetically pleasing, and carefully observe, analyze, or even report, that
which is not.

American Communists are shown to be beleaguered, pudgy, and sometimes effeminate. If a man wears gloves, he is somehow untrustworthy. At times, it is difficult to distinguish the FBI agents, who are actively pursuing particular characters, from the Communists, because they both sport similar long raincoats and wide-brimmed hats, as they lurk in dark areas. But somehow, the Communist "shadow looms larger and blacker" than that of the adversary. The Communists also typically walk with a forward tilt, exhibiting their commitment to a questionable cause. Occasionally, they are stylishly dressed, which shows them to be hypocrites. But the majority of these unsettling villains are scruffy looking--unkempt and unappealing.

Some films feature female Communists, who are as meticulously characterized as their male counterparts. They are what Nora Sayre refers to as the "Bad Blonde[s]." Traitorous activity is tipped off to the viewer by a slip strap showing through the woman's blouse. Female Communists typically order strong drinks and attempt to seduce naive and sensitive young men into the Party.

Both the male and female Communists show disrespect for revered American institutions--"by meeting in the Boston Public Gardens amid the swanboats, or by carrying a copy of the Reader's Digest or a TWA flight bag in order to recognize each other." These are not crimes per se, but merely symbols, which imply that if one is a member of the Communist Party, the right of free access to American conveniences and historic sites is somehow prohibited. Anyone
who violates this unwritten law is brazen and detestable, not to mention insincere. Communists show little respect for flags or animals; but the audience is not sure how these pseudo-citizens feel about children, as they never have any.

The characters ask questions in a harsh and boisterous manner, have no real sense of humor (they demand that many light-hearted jokes be explained to them, although they do enjoy an occasional diabolical chuckle at an evil occurrence), and are generally uncivil in conversation. Most smoke cigarettes in a luxurious, but mechanical manner, as if they are in some kind of hypnotic trance: "...they expel smoke very slowly from their nostrils before threatening someone's life, or suggesting that 'harm' will come to his family."\(^1\) Communists are further shown as unwilling to keep promises, prone to violently resist arrest, and careful to spy on one another, as well as "decent" Americans. Some are allowed "reasonable justifications" for joining the Party, like the Great Depression, the struggle to quell fascism abroad, or simple idealism. But in fact, idealism is regarded to be "useless" to the Party; and when these less aware, and therefore, in some ways, more innocent members realize their folly and attempt to resign, "their comrades either expose their membership to the FBI--so that they'll be jailed or deported--or kill them."\(^1\)

Communists were, in many ways, a replacement for gangsters in film. Thus the public was comfortable with this familiar stylized depiction of the criminal. Generally, Communists were so prone to eliminate one another that there seemed little left to do for the Federal Bureau of Investigation.\(^1\) But the film makers did employ the initially suspicious
but inevitably reassuring FBI agents as a wholly American force which the audience could trust, both in and out of the movie house, as father-figure and law enforcer.
SELECTED FILMS-- FROM SLANTED TO SATIRIC

*Woman on Pier 13* (1949)

*My Son John* (1952)

*Storm Center* (1956)

*Dr. Strangelove* (1964)

The first three films which I have selected to review mark separate progressive stages in the movement of the McCarthy era. The fourth, which I chiefly mention in order to exhibit the changing attitudes of later years, is an interesting and humorous satire on the attitudes of the period and symbolizes the definitive end to that historical era's remarkable influence. The movies caused a certain degree of laughter on my part, as they were viewed from contemporary eyes, and with a retrospective point of view; but each was, in its own way, intensely serious, and intended to create a response, honest or coerced, from an audience caught up in controversial nationwide political events. Together, they are an accurate portrait of the prevailing values of the Cold War, and they demonstrate the power of the motion picture medium.

At times, I also found myself actually filling with that contagious enthusiasm and patriotic fervor which was meant for the fifties viewer. Thus, the methods of these past film makers are still effective in their emotional aim. Intellectual consideration, combined with the bland aftertaste of the productions and sincere emotional reflection, eventually brought this critic to his senses. It must have been a challenge for the mass audience to do the same during the anti-Communist, anti-Soviet
wave of the McCarthy era.

**Woman on Pier 13**

(1949; RKO Radio Pictures; Director: Robert Stevenson)

Subtitled _I Married a Communist_, this film is the archetypal anti-Communist production in that it exhibits a "good versus evil" scenario, which leaves no doubt in the viewer that members of the Party are dishonest and driven solely by the quest to subvert. Directed by Robert Stevenson, this RKO Radio production pulls the audience in from the opening credits with tense music--an effect achieved by dissonant, nervous violins and the sharp beats of a snare drum. Suddenly, the tone changes, as the tune becomes pleasant and melodious. The screen pictures a car driving along a picturesque coastline through a comforting tunnel of blooming green trees.

Newlyweds Bradley and Nancy Collins pull up to a hotel and register for the first time. Nancy changes Brad's entry from "Bradley Collins and wife" to "Mr. and Mrs. Bradley Collins." This is not a strong feminist message, as Nancy later submits to Brad's stern commands, but rather serves as an innocuous flirtation between the couple.

Brad and Nancy have only known each other for a brief period of time, and Nancy is noticeably worried. Brad reassures her that the marriage was a wise, albeit spontaneous, decision. But both Nancy and the audience begin to worry when Brad meets an old flame, photographer Christine Chandler, in the hotel bar. She is blonde, stylishly dressed, a smoker, and an experienced drinker. The two have a brief and rather catty
conversation, during which Brad refers to Nan as "pretty...in a way." In fact, his new wife is rather nondescript; plain, but attractive. She represents wholesomeness and American values. She later joins the conversation, but does not feel at ease with Christine, who is unwelcoming and snide. Brad does not tell Nancy about his past relationship with Christine. Trouble is abrew.

In the next scene, the audience is privy to a conversation between Christine and Banning, the balding, overweight, unkempt leader of the local Communist Party. They are perusing the biographical background of Nancy and Brad. Nancy's brother, Don Lowry, is listed as "highly impressionable" (implying easily converted); Christine glances at an old picture of Brad and herself languishing at the beach. And so begins this tale of falsehoods and mystery which eventually leaves the audience ready to battle the forces of Communism with unfaltering conviction.

Bradley works for the Cornwall Shipping Company. He is now a Vice President, and was formerly a valued and amiable employee, deeply admired by his fellow workers. The company is in the midst of a dispute between owners and labor, and, after a few inciteful comments, Brad is naturally selected to be the mediator. He has friends among the top officials on both sides.

All appears as it should be--Brad is happily married, has a secure career future, and is admired by those with whom he works. But the audience feels uneasy, because they know that Brad formerly associated with Christine Palmer and can't, therefore, be all pure. In the next scene, a man named Jennings enters Brad's large and luxurious office, and, after
some brief repartee, accuses Brad of having been a Communist by the name of Frank Johnson. He gives a brief synopsis of Brad's life, stating that "Frank" had been a typical example of the lost generation of the thirties, in that he left school, was unable to find work, subsequently joined the Young Communist League, suddenly broke his association with the Party, and disappeared for unknown reasons. Brad says that it is "dangerous to call a man Communist" unless there is valid proof.

The next scene brings Brad to Christine Palmer's apartment. Again, after a short conversation, and some flirtation (recall that Brad is recently married, and that his integrity is even more questionable after this sexual innuendo), she hands him his old Party membership card. Christine pours some drinks (beer combined with shots of whiskey), and they continue their somewhat seductive conversation. Brad looks at the beach picture of the two of them, which Christine has brought to his attention. He mentions that they still look pretty good, side by side, and later moves to kiss her.

But all is not as it seems. Brad quickly pulls away, and scolds Christine for her insincerity. He states that he had wondered whether she wanted him back personally or for the Party, and that he now knows: "You thought you could yank me back to the Party, and then maybe yourself, part time, anyway. I graduated from you a long time ago; about the same time I quit this (referring to the membership card he is holding)." Bradley storms out, leaving his Party membership card as a souvenir. He has reformed and simply wants to live his life in the capitalist system which is now kind to him. But is it too late? Of course it is. In an anti-Communist film, even a
repentent Communist is held accountable for his/her past actions. Bradley is indeed doomed to pay for his earlier mistake. Communism, like any other "crime," requires punishment--and customarily, punishment must be capital.

Banning, the Party boss, indirectly summons Brad to a meeting. Brad is contacted, by phone, and then face-to-face, by two men--one large and quiet, the other thin and swarthy. Both smoke cigarettes and wear snap-brim hats and long raincoats. Brad is at a cocktail party being given by the President of the shipping company when they arrive; he is dressed in a black tuxedo. They advise him, in a forceful manner, to leave the party and come with them, but first to change his clothes because they are "too fancy for where we're goin'." Brad lies to his wife, stating that he is leaving the party in order to check out a problem with one of the ships. This is a bad omen. One should never lie to one's wife, symbol of goodness, before leaving a party with two Communist thugs.

Brad is driven to the docks, and, after a short but ominously silent elevator ride, is brought to a secret room in an old warehouse. There, he witnesses Banning, cigarette in hand, as he chides a current Party member, who was seen coming out of an FBI office. The frightened member swears that he never betrayed the Party, but is forcibly removed, as he continues to profess his loyalty.

The leader then tells Brad that "the Party decides who's out and when," and orders him to give 2/5 of his salary (which the leader claims is a known figure to the Party) to an organization called Men, Inc. (the name implies that the concept of the common bond of "men" is also a profitable
front for the Party). Brad gallantly and adamantly refuses. A small, quiet, intellectual looking man with a thin moustache shows Bradley out. They go to the docks, and Bradley watches as the man who had been accused of disloyalty is bound and thrown into the water to drown, amidst his protests of innocence. "Tell Banning I saw what he wanted me to see," says Brad.

Banning attempts to blackmail the reformed Communist. First, he warns Brad that he will bring to his employer's attention the fact that Brad used to be a Communist Party member. But Brad states that he will take his chances, as "a 50-50 chance (with his boss) is 50 percent better than his chances with the Party." Banning tries again, stating that a past incident, in which a shop steward was killed in a wildcat walk-out, is on photostat at the main Party office located in New Jersey (Brad's face intimates that he was involved and would surely be arrested if this were discovered). Brad reluctantly decides to acquiesce. He is ordered to keep the talks between the union and the owners tied up and to force the closure of the docks, in order that the Party might strengthen its foothold and break up this example of free enterprise.

This is the beginning of the end for Bradley, as he submits to the threats which, if carried out, could end his persistently sought social and economic success. The movie warns its viewers never to join the Communist Party, as once an individual becomes a member, there is no returning to a state of innocence. The Communist Party will catch up to every card carrier and maintain its constricting grasp until all usefulness is exausted.
Meanwhile, Christine seeks to convert Nancy's brother. Don is brought to a gathering of some local Party members and gets involved in a political discussion. One fellow expresses his view that "man is the state, and state is man; therefore unions are unnecessary." This simplistic logic presents a fallacious argument which is supposed to convince the audience that Communist views are merely plays on words, and not legitimate theory. Besides, it doesn't matter whether or not Don consciously agrees with the ideologies, as long as he can spew the preachings and join the ranks. He is referred to as "very receptive." This Party intends to strip him of his individual beliefs and instill in him a new set of values. He is a useful pawn, not a human being who might contribute his own thoughtful ideas. The Party line is set; no variation is necessary or desired.

Don, who had originally been hired by Bradley to work for the shipping company, is pictured, with tense music playing in the background, vehemently arguing at a union meeting. The audience knows that he is now a Party stooge.

However, the film has a romantic twist. Christine is at first a mechanical seducer, luring Don into the organization: "Keep an open mind," she tells him. "You'd be surprised what you can learn. . . . I'm gonna be very proud of you Don, eventually." And they kiss. But gradually, particularly after the leader tells Christine that she has no private life and is beginning to forget her duties, she grows more emotional and human. At an airport scene, Don tells her that he wants to be married. "Don, you really want to marry me; no questions?" she asks. Again, they kiss. But this is
not feigned sentimentality, it is genuine affection. Christine is drifting from the Party, and she is now doomed.

Meanwhile, Bradley is on poor terms with both his loyal wife, and the union. He refuses to confide in Nancy after he returns home with a gunshot wound, given to him as a warning by the Party boss. When Bradley enters his darkened home, he is pictured in the shadow of the window bars—a blatant symbol of captivity by the Communist Party. His wife opens the bedroom door, and in bursts a stream of light (symbol of her purity). But Brad refuses her help and orders her to return to the bedroom. He is alone in this affair, embittered because he is back with the Party. It now controls his moods and actions.

Jim Travis, head of the union, visits the Collins house, and requests a fresh start with the talks. But Brad is unwilling to "help [his] old friends," even at his wife's pleading, and to re-open negotiations. "What's come over you Brad," she asks. "What's wrong with you?" The audience knows; it is the omnipotent and sinister Communist Party.

Brad offers Jim a drink, the symbol of suspicion in these films, and Jim refuses. The union boss mentions that "Don is spouting the Commie line word for word" at union meetings. Brad defends the Party: "Why is anyone with different ideas always called a Commie?" Once again, albeit subconsciously, he demonstrates his loyalty.

Jim, who had once dated Nancy (another one of those convenient romantic twists), states that it is his job to keep the Commie minority out of power. Jim is a kind, sincere protagonist, and thus the audience feels that this must be their position as well. Bradley presses, by asking
how the Communists come into power in the first place. Jim replies with conviction: "They know how. They're trained to recruit stooges--the liberals, the unemployed, the lovesick."

In a later scene, Christine tells Don that she is a member of the Party, and Don, not yet an entrenched member, rejects her. She asks: "What have politics got to do with you and me?" Don responds, by asking her to name one fine person who is in the Party; she shows him the picture of Bradley and herself at the beach. When the Communist Party leader bursts in, Don punches him and flees the scene. Don has only been an unwitting assistant to the Party, duped by his love for Christine and his idealism. But this is enough to make him guilty in the film-maker's eyes.

The leader responds by having Don killed in a fake hit-and-run accident. Christine Norman calls Nancy to warn her; but it is too late. As excitement mounts, the viewer is growing increasingly to despise the injustices. Brad stops Nancy from phoning the police to tell of her brother's death. But because she no longer trusts him, she moves to call Christine Norman. He orders her to the bedroom, and she submits. The acting is poor, as Nancy seems barely distraught at her brother's death. But perhaps she is just numbed by the entire melodrama.

Nancy asserts herself, and goes to visit Christine, where once again, Chris shows the picture as evidence that Brad was a Communist. Nancy is told the identity of her brother's killer, and then to leave. Christine is now considered a traitor and a risk to the Party. She is too emotional; Communists are supposed to be robot-like in action and thought process. Banning goes to her apartment, where Christine is now writing her
confession about the methods and ideals of the Party. Banning grabs and
burns the letter, tells her of his plans to eliminate this "emotional
woman" and "not bring politics into it" (so as to keep the organization
safe), and forces her out a window to her death.

Nancy locates the assassin, a greasy-looking amusement park vendor
who runs the shooting gallery. She returns his overt and disconcerting
flirtations, and leaves with him for a bar. He is tough, unfriendly, and
sternly warns his assistant to "keep his hands out of the till" as he exits
with Nancy. He is amoral--and Communist.

The denouement is at hand. Brad realizes that his wife is missing,
learns where she has gone, and heads for the amusement park. His true
nature is coming to the surface. Love is more powerful than communism.
A vendor (unbeknownst to Brad, another member of the Party) offers to
assist him. He leads Brad to an alley, and attempts to knock him out. But
Brad's will is stronger than this Party stooge's, and he knocks the vendor
out.

Meanwhile, the assassin is located by the sinister, moustached Party
member and told that he is drinking with Don Lowry's sister. They leave
and drive to the warehouse, the dingy symbol of hidden subversives and
confused ideas. Brad heads for the warehouse, as well.

The final confrontation is brief, but delivers the desired point. Brad
sneaks into the warehouse and fights off two thugs in the elevator. He
discovers his wife, Banning, and the assassin in the secret room. "People
like you are too emotional for the Party," says Banning, gun in hand. He
pulls out a cigarette and phones the police. This phone call symbolizes the
audacity of the Communist Party, which is taunting the audience by using the American source of law and order for its own, evil ends. But Brad knocks the gun away and flees with Nancy.

A chase ensues. Brad incapacitates the assassin, then hides behind a large crate with his wife. "Why didn't you come to me?" she asks. Brad's response is somber and sincere: "Because I didn't want you to know that the great Bradley Collins wasn't." While Brad's back is turned, the audience sees Banning catch sight of Nancy, and move toward the two. Nancy has tears in her eyes, as she seems to be mouthing a prayer. (Will God be on their side?) Brad suddenly whirls around, grabs a hook from one of the crates, and hurls it at Banning. The Party leader shoots, but is then hit by the hook, and falls over a railing to his death.

However Banning's bullet finds its mark, and Bradley is dying in his wife's arms as police enter the scene. Jim Travis is also present. Brad's last words echo his regret and the film's warning: "Nan... made a mistake... Jim... Jim's the right man for you... always was...I told you, you came along too late for me." Translation: Jim is goodness, you are goodness, I was a part of organized evil. Therefore, I don't deserve to live. Go and prosper.

*Woman on Pier 13* warns viewers never to consider the dishonest, constricting Communist Party as a viable political option. The Party is erroneously portrayed as an underground mob bent on converting impressionable youngsters to a life of organized crime. The final message states that once an individual joins the Party, there is no return to innocence. The characterizations are clear-cut. Nancy (symbol of piety and potential motherhood), Jim Travis (symbol of American patriotism and
anti-Communism), and Mr. Cornwall, (owner of the shipping company and symbol of capitalism) are inherently good; The Party leader and his stooges are entirely evil; Bradley, Don, and Christine are reformed wrongdoers who get caught by their initial mistakes. The plot is involved; the theme is all too elementary. Falsehoods and stereotypical characters are essential aspects of this example of American anti-Communist propaganda.

_My Son John_
(1952; Paramount Pictures; Director: Leo McCarey)

Leo McCarey co-wrote, produced, and directed this production which shows the struggle between wholesome values and communism taking place in a seemingly ideal American home. This particular film maker "had been a particularly friendly witness before the Committee in 1947; in 1950, he had joined Cecil B. DeMille in urging all members of the Screen Director's Guild to take a loyalty oath." McCarey carried this patriotic fervor onto his work, as he presents this five-person clan (particularly the mother) in increasing distress over one member who has ideologically gone astray.

_My Son John_ is an artistic wonder, as it uses nearly every revered American ideal and institution in order to display that which is at stake in the average household—particularly religion. The film opens with images of communality and neighborhood spirit. Children are playing kickball in the street. The camera, almost randomly, stops at one particular house. In
front of the ample, two-story, welcoming abode stand a father and his two handsome, virile, late-teenage sons near the family car. They are waiting for their mother, who is readying herself for Sunday Mass. The father impatiently honks the car horn.

When they arrive at church, the mother, Lucille, sits in between her two supportive sons, and mouths audibly prays. The priest is pictured outside the church; he momentarily runs, as he is late for the service. After Mass, the family and the priest have a brief and light-hearted conversation. They have known each other for many years. The movie is endearing; the characters are immediately likable. McCarey wastes no time in setting up the viewer's bias; these are clearly protagonists.

This particular Sunday is a sad, but honorable occasion. The two boys, Ben and Chuck, are about to leave for a tour in the armed forces. At their last home-cooked dinner, one member of the family is noticeably missing: John, who rarely visits home, is still at work in Washington, and phones to say that he cannot make it home. The boys console their mother, who wishes that the whole family could be together on this important family day. But mother and father (Dan) somberly see the brave youths off. (The priest drives the boys to their unseen military destination.)

One week later, John comes to visit. He is large, quiet, and smokes cigarettes. When he enters the house, he gives his mother a warm hug, but is merely cordial with his father. There is a visible rift between the two men. John's mother is elated at his return home; she loves her sons equally and is as visibly proud of this one as she is of Ben and Chuck.

John works in Washington, but his parents aren't sure what his
specific position entails. John's father, a grammar school teacher, is a
zealous member of the American Legion and preparing to run for the
presidency of the local chapter. At his mother's suggestion, John offers to
help his father with his election speech. Dad is careful to tell John of his
nationalistic ideals, and even sings a feverishly patriotic legion song, "If
you don't like your Uncle Sammy." His son feigns association with the
sentiment and walks up the stairs to his room, mock singing the song.
John does not respect his father; but worse he is brazenly obvious about it.

John’s mother, a neurotic but maternal and loving character, does her
best to keep the confrontations to a minimum. She has been having
tension-inspired dizzy spells of late, and the local doctor, during a
friendly housecall, prescribes some relaxation pills. She stubbornly
protests the prescription, and, under the pretense of taking them in the
kitchen, places them in a penny jar. John talks with the doctor, and
professes his admiration for research and science. "But someone put them
there for us to discover," says the doctor. This juxtaposition makes the
audience take notice. The doctor, a representative of scientific discovery,
defends religious ideals, while John, this member of a pious clan, opposes
them. "You mean someone hides things?" responds John. The doctor then
cites the wonder of creation; John is obviously dubious. Could this be an
atheist in our midst?

Later, John and his parents attend a church service. After Mass, the
three family members have a short chat with the priest. This is not a
comfortable exchange, however, as John makes an awkward and what is
clearly made out to be, disrespectful joke: "I see you lead the good life,
Father. We take care of you down here and you take care of us later." The humor is not well-received; the priest is visibly insulted. Judging from his encounters with science (the doctor) and religion (the priest), John is subtly, but unmistakably, branded an enemy of right values.

On the way home from church, John asks to be dropped off at the local teachers' college, so that he might pay his respects to a professor friend who teaches there. Before they arrive, John mentions that he will be delivering the Commencement Address at his old alma mater. His parents express an interest in attending, but John tells them not to bother: "Don't come; it's too far and time is short. I'll send you a copy of the speech." After he is dropped off, John's father states: "He didn't invite us. We're lowbrow. He'll probably invite his highbrow professor." John is portrayed as a snobbish intellectual, and not even remotely a family man. He visits home only as an obligation, and not as a pleasure. He is too politically involved for such sentimentality.

On the way home, John's parents accidentally collide with another car. Inside this vehicle, unbeknownst to them, is Mr. Stedman, an FBI agent, who has staged the accident in order to find out more about John's activities. He later visits their home, and speaks with John's mother about the bill, and then, after some friendly conversation, about the family in general. He is shown a picture of Ben and Chuck, side by side in football uniforms. "One would pass to the other," Lucille says. "You have two fine boys," responds the agent, fishing for more. "I have three sons," she says. "John is the bright one in the family. He has more degrees than a thermometer." As a reader and a thinker, John does not enjoy sports.
This, in itself, is a suspicious characteristic for such a burly American man.

In a later conversation, John's mother mentions the accident and the man's visit to John, and then begins to talk about Ben and Chuck. John asks his mother about this inquisitive stranger, and ignores the subject of his siblings altogether. He is more concerned about his personal welfare than that of his brothers, who are about to push off to the Korean War.

Later, John speaks with his tired mother, who is lying on her bed after a dizzy spell. He explains his ideologies to her: "Don't let father poison your thinking. The world is in turmoil. Young thinkers are dreaming of the future.... We must learn to tear down our spiked fences.... I love humanity; I love the downtrodden, the helpless minorities." John's mother cries. She approves of his apparently selfless ideals: "People teased me because you were my favorite. . . . I prayed that whatever was good in me would become a part of you." John stands up: "You see, we talk the same language, think the same things," he says. "I warn you, this is liberal thinking." John is even trying to subvert his own mother. He continues: "We're labeled leftist, communist, subversive." And he states that he'd swear on a stack of Bibles that he wasn't these things. His mother takes him up on this gracious offer, and there follows one of the movie's most powerful scenes. John, with one hand on a Bible which rests in his mother's hands, and the other hand raised in oath, looks heavenward and states: "I swear that I am not now, nor have I ever been a member of the Communist Party." There is a sudden burst of tense music to underscore the impact of this statement. With this lie, in the eyes of his mother and
God, John has surely signed his death warrant.

John then heads downstairs to be confronted by his father. John tells of the oath which he took, but his father responds with a continued lack of faith in his offspring: "But if you were a . . . [he cannot bring himself to say the word "communist"], if you were, the Bible wouldn't mean anything to you." His father reaches for a Bible, the same one on which John's mother had taught her son psalms and parables as a child, and shakes it at him in lecture. With increased frustration, the father strikes his son on the head with this family heirloom. John falls, ripping his pants in the process. His mother rushes down, scolds her husband, and takes John's pants for repair. John tells her to get rid of them, as they are now useless.

The next day, Ben and Chuck phone from their port of call. Ben speaks to his brother: "You keep up the fight on the home front, won't you, John?" There is a boat horn, and the boys say good-bye to their mother. She reluctantly bids them farewell: "Good-bye...(pause) boys." Later, John leaves for Washington. On the way out the door, his mother shouts: "Now don't forget, you're my tomorrows, John." John is not fighting the war at home, nor does he care that he is an important factor in his mother's health. John has only one responsibility, and that is to the future of the Party. Later that evening, John's father stumbles into the house after an evening of drinking. Lucille is waiting up for him, and they have a conversation amid the slapstick drunken stumbles of John's father. "You're suspicious of anyone with liberal views," she says. Dan shows her a newspaper headline which refers to the impending threat of a Communist ring in Washington: "Ruth Carlin Sentenced: Refuses to Name Others." He
then speaks of his role as a teacher, and mentions the fact that he was chastised by a parent for having mentioned God in the classroom. He comments on the changing values of the times. God is losing the battle in America, and the film maker wants to change this degenerative eventuality.

A few days later, John calls his mother from Washington. She is mightily excited at his call: "I hope your day is as bright as you've made mine," she says. He wastes little time with congeniality, as he asks his mother to retrieve the torn pants that he had left behind. She realizes that he is worried, and promises to comply with his request. A few moments later, Stedman arrives at the house. When Lucille answers the door, she is noticeably apprehensive. It is as if she suddenly knows Stedman's true profession and assignment. Stedman admits that he is an FBI agent, and Lucille barely flinches. "You looked more shocked when you saw me than when you found out who I am," he says. They speak for a few moments. Lucille realizes that this man represents the potential arrest of her son, and she expresses her disrespect for his questionable techniques. "Our methods are criticized," he says. "Insurance agencies protect themselves by a thorough investigation, as well." She states that she cannot help him and leaves the house open to the agent, as she exits the scene.

Lucille heads for the church. She has donated John's pants to a clothes drive, and is forced to look through a pile of old clothes with the parish priest. She cannot bring herself to tell the clergyman how the pants came to be torn. She locates them and nervously fishes around the
pockets and seams, in order to locate what John might be looking for in the article. She finds a key sewn into the wasteband. As the friendly priest begins to discuss the situation of Ben and Chuck, John's mother nervously excuses herself and leaves the scene. She cannot think of anything but her potentially disloyal eldest son.

Lucille decides to return the pants in person, in order to discover what the key represents. She travels to Washington and visits her son in his office. John fidgets at her arrival. He eyes the trousers, which she lays on his desk as they make awkward small talk: "You're not particularly glad to see me, but you're glad to see the trousers," Lucille says. He picks up the trousers, replaces them on the desk, and feigns concern: "When you said you'd walk, I called back to ask you to take a cab." Of course, John didn't even consider picking her up personally, a kindness too humane and considerate for a Communist. John takes the pants out of the package and feels around the wasteband for the key. His mother realizes his commitment to the Party. When she looks him in the eyes and says: "I can't help you anymore. Don't deceive me. What are you looking for? Is it a key?" (She holds up the key.) He attempts a lie: "It's the key to my apartment." But Lucille knows that his word is no longer reliable. She has lost faith in John, just as he has lost faith in the family and God.

Lucille leaves the office, confused and melancholy. She sits on a park bench facing the Jefferson Memorial, and stares into the distance. Stedman suddenly appears, (Lucille is too fatigued to show surprise) and starts a conversation. "Jefferson called this liberty of ours a gift of God," he says. Stedman then points out some of the various historic landmarks,
ending with the Arlington Cemetery. He states that the cemetery was founded "for those who gave their lives for...(pause) us." He speaks of her children, and says that "we have to fight on the homefront for them."

Still thinking about her son's welfare, Lucille does not trust this G-man. "What are you trying to do," she asks, "fire up my patriotism?" He mentions the case on which he is working. Tense music begins coinciding with Lucille's fear at the first formal mention of a case involving Communists. Stedman shows her a newspaper headline which states that Red spy ring hire-ups are being "hunted." He asks if Ruth Carlin might have called John while he was visiting at home, if she remembers answering the call (she does), and if she can identify the voice at FBI headquarters. Lucille goes along with him, accompanied by somber violin music. "It was not a good connection, I remember that," she says.

After she leaves the FBI building, Lucille decides to follow up on a personal hunch. John's mother locates Ruth Carlin's apartment and checks to see if the key that she found in John's wasteband fits. She is secretly followed and filmed by an FBI agent, and Stedman and an assistant analyze the results for the audience. As she reaches for the door, the assistant says: "Her hand is shaking." Stedman shows his warmth and humanity by responding: "I don't blame her; mine would too." This segment shows the FBI to be a friendly and sympathetic unit which regrets the painful job it sometimes has to do. When the key fits, Lucille now knows for sure that her son is a Communist--and an influential one at that.

Lucille returns home, to lie on her bed, grieving for her lost son. She holds a rosary in her hands. Her husband walks in, lies next to her, and
apologizes for the way he has acted. But it is Lucille who feels obliged to beg forgiveness. Dan refers to himself as "dumb," and his spouse quickly responds: "You're not dumb. You're the brightest, the dearest. You listen to your heart. You're not blinded by it." She refers to his judgement as clear, honest, and clean. And so the father is shown to be an emotional character, but morally admirable. (Nora Sayre argues that: "...by making a paranoid fascist of the father and a religious psychopath of the mother, the film also makes Communism sound rather tempting." I would disagree, as these parents are shown to have faults which are not truly extremist patriotism and religiosity. Their characters are, at most, eccentric.)

John returns home to retrieve the key, and faces his mother's newfound courage and uncharacteristic anger: "You'll spend time in a Federal prison if you can't explain this key to Ruth's apartment," she says. John replies: "Ruth Carlin and I were intimate." Fornication is taboo; however, the audience subsequently feels even less respect for this lustful Party leader.

Lucilleoptimistically makes a suggestion: "Let's tell Stedman." "We can't tell him. He's out to persecute innocent people," John replies. "You're lying again," says his mother, growing impatient. (Note that the audience never knows John's actual profession, as it is merely implied that he works for the U.S. government, and is therefore liable and fit for prosecution. These films often show any member of the Communist Party to be worthy of condemnation. John is just officially caught by the nature of his work.)
Lucille tells John that he is not to "make that speech to the graduating class," as she does not want him to "infect other mother's sons and daughters." They quarrel: "You're spreading despair disguised as hope," she says. "Mother, how do you plan to stop me?" he responds, an evil line, as John has just indirectly threatened his own mother. "There are issues today that transcend mother and son," she says. Lucille is now clearly a representative of all that is good in America. Her loyalty to her country even outweighs the bond to her offspring.

Lucille speaks of individuality and threatens to turn John in to the authorities. John brings up his mother's waning health: "In your case, no one would believe you, and I'd have to go along with it." John is now blackmailing his mother into knuckling under. "You'd have me put in a sanitarium?" she asks. John grabs his mother's clenched hand, hoping to extract the key. Now using brutal force on his own mother, John is surprised when out falls a rosary instead. "What a fight you have on your hands," she says. This scene directly implies that all Communists are pitted against God in the struggle for domination.

Stedman arrives at the house and meets John face-to-face. John wants to ask a few questions, but this is not allowed: "We gather information," says Stedman. "We don't give it out," thus officially condoning the secretive practices and policies of the FBI, made necessary by the secretive Communists. Lucille speaks of getting rid of her "old fashioned American home." Clearly, she feels that the house is now tainted, since John was raised in this symbol of love and American values.

Lucille lectures John, begging him to be like his brothers: "He died to
make men holy; they may die to make men free," she says. "You never played [sports]. Keep on studying. There are other goals, John. We're fighting on Ben and Chuck's side again. Take the ball, John. Time's running out. Take the ball before the clock runs out." Football, a great American pastime, is used as the symbol for carrying the nation's torch of freedom.

John does not give in to her pleas. "Take him away," says his mother. "He has to be punished." Stedman calls John "sick," and states that his conscience must be nauseating. "The lower you sink, the higher you rise in the Party," he says. Looking at John's mother, Stedman admits that "she's taken an awful beating." John has emotionally sapped his mother of her lifeblood in betraying the founding ideologies of his country. Of course, it is never shown that one of these ideologies is freedom of belief.

John's mother feels ill; Dan carries her to the bedroom. Meanwhile, John escapes out a window. Before leaving, he overhears his father say that he has a "traitor for a son." Speaking to the doctor, who has come to examine Lucille, Dan states: "Never in her life has she done anything [wrong]. She's an angel from heaven." A call comes from the bedroom: "Dan, Dan, let's pray for John," moans Lucille. Dan re-enters the bedroom from the hallway, and they pray: "Our Father...(fade out.)" Message: one is a traitor to one's mother if one is a Communist.

Their prayers are answered. John experiences a dramatic change of heart, and phones Stedman from his Washington office. He wants to do the "one decent thing" and also still be allowed to deliver his speech. "We don't make deals," says the FBI agent. He advises the reformed American: "Everyone's life had some purpose, even Judas" he says. "John, use
whatever free will you still have; make your decision and get over here."

John looks at a letter on his desk, which notified him that he has been named an honorary Doctor of Laws by his alma mater. He then looks at a picture of his mother. Dialogue of admonishment and his decision to correct his errors from past scenes is dubbed over the image. A choir is heard in the background. John decides to tape his speech, almost as if he knows that he won’t be able to deliver it. He phones FBI headquarters a second time. Stedman suddenly notices that the call is being monitored from some outside source. He tells John to leave, and take Pennsylvania Avenue. On the way to FBI headquarters, John’s car is chased and he is gunned down (assumedly by Communists). His car crashes on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial. Stedman arrives on the scene, and John says: "Hello Mr. Stedman; they got me." As he slowly dies, he apologizes for his mistakes, and asks that the tape of the speech be delivered in his place. Stedman asserts the power of the government: "If I think the students should hear it, they'll hear it," he says.

The next scene pictures Stedman on the stage of Commencement exercises. He explains what happened to John, and introduces the tape. A beam of light is shined on the lectern: "A Lisbon plane would have carried me from the laws," says the recorded voice, "but not from myself and my conscience. You only find freedom here... stimulants lead to narcotics... it is the lure of the American sense of justice and sense of fair play to rebel against evil." The graduates, including uniformed ROTC students, listen intently. "Brains are numbed; faith in man replaces faith in God. Even now, the eyes of Soviet agents are on some of you... Before I
realized the enormity of the steps I had taken, I was an enemy of my country and a servant of a foreign power. . . . I am a living lie; I am a traitor; I am a native, American, Communist, spy. And may God have mercy on my soul."

John's parents, who attended the ceremony, walk out of the auditorium, and come upon the college chapel. "Let's pray for John," says Lucille. "There was a lot of good in his speech," says the father, somberly, but proudly. Lucille agrees: "Let's hope and pray that they forget what he did, and remember what he said today." As the couple walks out of the scene, the camera moves up to the stained glass window of the chapel. Stirring religious music ends the film.

The symbolism contained within this film could fill an entire volume of analysis. It seems that almost every line of dialogue and individual characterization works toward the intended theme, which portrays communism as a threat to religion, the family, and the future of America. Leo McCarey must have exceeded his expectations, as this tiny cast gave the impression that it comprised a much larger picture. Essentially, the audience relates with John's immediate family, and the few local professionals with whom they come into contact—a doctor, a priest, and an FBI agent. No other significant characters come into the scenario.

The inter-relationships evoke various emotional reactions from the audience. Each character represents a particular, unaltering ideology. The viewers empathize with those patriotic Americans who have to deal with John and yet maintain their particular religious and nationalistic values. The audience wholly despises the title character, until he finally
repents and decides to turn himself in to the Bureau. Of course, his death was a deserved one, and the observer feels little genuine sympathy. Communists are lucky to live in these films, and featured performers who realize their disloyal mistakes are most often martyrs for the repentent cause.

John puts the doctor on the defensive for the cause of creation (an untypical role for a representative of natural laws), the priest on the defensive for his personal integrity and the validity of religion, and his parents on the defensive for their roles as teachers and responsible authorities. In each conflict, John is less endearing and friendly, as he coldly spouts his views. Thus, the audience is dragged into its support for American ideals, organized religion, and parental blamelessness.

Symbols and institutions worthy of preservation are equally plain. The American Legion, regardless of its silly songs and staunch anti-Communist beliefs, is represented by the father, who is shown to have been correct in his conclusions and actions by the end of the production. The armed forces and football are equated with each other as team sports which deserve full enthusiasm from every citizen of conscience. The FBI is shown to be a justifiably secretive, information-gathering organization, as well as a protector of religious ideas.

Lucille is the most powerful symbol, as her faith in John proves to be unfounded. John does not care that his secret political actions are contributing to his mother's physical and emotional deterioration. But she finally overcomes her obligation as a mother, as her spiritual support for
John is no longer sincere. Lucille delivers the final punch, in siding with the Federal Bureau of Investigation over her favorite (or at least formerly favorite) offspring. Even the sanctity of familial ties and motherhood are not safe from the forces of Party evil, says the film. Lucille (and the film's audience) must beware and be loyal to the bond of loyalty over all other connections. America is the one proven ally.

*Storm Center*

(1956; Phoenix Productions; Director: Daniel Taradash)

*Storm Center* was Columbia Pictures' attempt to reverse some of the unjust and inaccurate messages that had been emanating from the movie screen in the late 1940s and early to mid-1950s. It is a fascinating production, which falls short of committing itself to the defense of Communists in general, but which, at least, defends the right to freedom of the press and personal judgement. It made a significant and comprehensible moral statement near the end of this relentless and confusing period, and marks a major turning point in American film.

Directed by Daniel Taradash, the production features Bette Davis as Alicia Hull, a librarian who is asked by the local city council to remove a book, which they consider to be seditionist, from the library shelves. The council had been receiving complaints about the "Tolskin" (note: sounds like the name of the "accepted" novelist Tolstoy) work from various nationalistic individuals and patriotic organizations, and in order to preserve its influence with these voters, resolves to dispose of the book
Alicia had been asking the council to appropriate funds for a children's wing in the library for some time. When she is called to meet with the organization, she assumes that they have decided to grant her request. The members take her out to lunch at Morrisey's, and inform her that they have decided to allocate funds for the new wing, but they also mention their "problem" with the book. Paul Duncan, the chairman of the group, asks her to remove the example of Soviet propaganda from the shelves.

Alicia agrees that the book is not a worthwhile effort: "I think it's a preposterous creation," she says. "Don't you want everyone to know how preposterous it is?" asks Mr. Duncan. Alicia begins a viable argument: "If I took every book off I thought was preposterous..." But she is cut off: "It could stir up a hornets' nest. We want it out of the library. You've got your children's wing; now do this for us." Alicia reluctantly consents, and the scene ends with her line: "I was never forced to remove a book from the library before." This blackmail of sorts immediately puts the council in a negative light in the eyes of the viewers. The organization has achieved its questionable ends too quickly, and thus the audience feels that the council, in opposing the wishes of the likeable Mrs. Hull, is probably fighting for an unjust cause.

When Alicia returns to the library, she asks her assistant, Miss Lockridge, how one disposes of a book. "Is it worn out?" asks the assistant. "No," replies Alicia, "It's not pornographic, not worn out, not an old edition... (she thinks for a moment). It's my problem." When closing the
library, Mrs. Hull defiantly replaces the book in its proper spot on the shelf. With this decision, she has opened herself up to public criticism and pressure. But she is of sound mind and visibly conscious and proud of her choice. The audience might be unsure of her decision at this point in the film, but they admire her integrity and her courage.

Alicia, who has lived in the town for most of her approximately fifty years, is a highly respected and beloved member of the community. She is a friend to children and a source of literary enthusiasm and admiration for the townfolk. But when the council discovers that she has replaced the book, they attack her with little hesitation. This once respected member of the community becomes a target, for which the council has no compassion. Mr. Duncan discovers that Alicia was formerly a member of the "Council for Better Relations with the Soviet Union," "American Peace Mobilization," and "Voice of Freedom Committee." Mrs. Hull admits her past memberships without a falter: "A lot of people joined during the war," she says. "I resigned when I found out they were Communist fronts." But Mr. Duncan points out that she knowingly sponsored another Communist organization. He produces a list which contains her name. "May I see that?" she asks. She peruses the paper, and securely states: "My name was used without consent." But the council chairman does not believe the essence of her statement: "Still, it's a Communist outfit, so you must have believed in the ideas," he says. But Alicia asserts her loyalty: "I am not a Communist. I never was a Communist. I detest Communism."

The council is an aggressive misinterpreter of information. Like McCarthy, it accuses without probable cause. Alicia steadfastly defends
the right to freedom of the press, but she refuses to support the concept of or belief in Communism. This is the full extent to which the movie is willing to risk its integrity. Still, it is a fairly long limb on which the film maker decided to walk. The production marks a middle step toward more formal tolerance.

Alicia maintains her stance and is subsequently fired by the council. Even Roberts, her close friend on this local board, goes along with the general consensus and votes for the immediate termination of her employment. The community follows this line, and socially ostracizes their former heroine. A sparcely attended town meeting is held for Alicia's benefit at the local church. One man states: "If we go into this (i.e. attempt to defend her) we're going to be called Reds." But the minister chimes in: "That shouldn't stop us." His statement is a significant step forward, as religion is now taking the side of intellectual freedom--a radical move. The townspeople are not admirable, but rather an insecure group which does not want to risk its own political safety for the benefit of another.

Alicia resolves to handle the matter on her own, and the town does little to sway her from this brave maneuver. Storm Center portrays an individual standing on her own morality. It shows the potentially debilitating force of group opinion and the clear integrity of an individual's stance for integrity. Might, says the film, does not necessarily make right.

Martha, Alicia's assistant and eventual replacement as head librarian, is coincidentally dating the head of the council. During one scene, Mr.
Duncan speaks of marriage, but Martha is insecure about another lifelong commitment, because she is once divorced, and afraid of repeating the mistake. Paul Duncan defends the concept of taking chances: "It was just a mistake. Making mistakes is part of living." This is both foreshadowing as well as a vague reference to other films. First, it reflects the mistake which the council will later regret, in having fired an admirable citizen. Secondly, it subtly states that former Communists should indeed be forgiven for past mistakes, and not inevitably be condemned to die for their misguided ideals, as they were in so many other movies. Still, it does not show that the belief in Communism and Party membership does not constitute a punishable crime.

Children who once spoke eagerly with Mrs. Hull and solicited her to purchase raffle tickets suddenly refuse to talk to her, and, despite the fact that she finally offers to buy the tickets, they falsely tell her that the raffle is over. They avert her gaze which pleads for love. One special friend, Freddie, to whom Alicia had lent, and then personally inscribed and given a book entitled Stories from the Bible, suddenly refuses to associate with her. His friends ridicule him, and "double dare" him to visit Mrs. Hull. Freddie is physically small, but emotionally complex, just as Alicia is physically older, but morally sturdy. Their relationship is the key to the entire film. Freddie is hurt by the fact that this former friend has turned out to be, according to the local citizens, a traitor to her country. He rebels in frustration, because he is, in large part, a product of his community, and particularly his intolerant, anti-Communist father. He resolves to detest Mrs. Hull and scratches out the inscription in his
During one scene, members of the council and their "significant others" are drinking and discussing at the local country club. Mr. Duncan divulges the fact that this issue is a major political bonus in his quest for a position in the legislature. He is clearly more than idealistically motivated; he is selfish and career-oriented. A conversation on the topic of Alicia's welfare ensues. One woman states: "She's a danger to the community," while another says simply: "I loved her." This is a head versus heart conflict. The film maker clearly sides with the latter, as the heart has a more sentimental and admirable appeal, eventually proved by the production's more flatteringly portrayed characters (Roberts, Mrs. Lockridge, the minister, Freddie's mother).

Roberts suddenly, almost miraculously, remembers his affinity to Alicia, and mentions how wonderful and interesting life was when her husband, who was killed in France during World War II, was alive. He recalls the fact that Stephen Hull co-founded the very country club in which they are sitting. One woman states that he was a radical, too. But Roberts lightens up the serious and accusatory nature of this statement: "Yes, very," he says. "He always drove over the water in golf. It was the last time the club had any pep. Alicia was the kind of girl that should've had twenty kids." Alicia is now an affirmed protagonist, and the audience is rooting for her success.

Eventually, the children's wing is built, and a dedication ceremony is scheduled to take place. Roberts realizes that he has betrayed his friendship with Alicia and visits her apartment to make amends. When he
arrives, he discovers that Alicia is packing her belongings intending to leave town. Roberts feels guilty for the lack of support which he and the townfolk have shown: "You have a reason to despise me--all of us," he says. But he insists, after some reminiscing about Steve and the "good life" of the past, that she accompany him to the dedication ceremony, for which she had fought so hard. She somewhat reluctantly accepts.

The dedication ceremony is a model of Americana and nationalism. Twin blonde girls sing a patriotic song, as a brass band plays in the background. Freddie, who won a contest in which the participants had to name the ten most worthwhile books to be placed in the new wing's cornerstone, is asked to read his winning entry at the podium. *Stories from the Bible* is one of the titles listed. Alicia enters the scene, and Freddie cannot complete his reading. The master of ceremonies finishes for him, and tells him that he may sit down.

When the time comes for the ground breaking, Roberts, who is asked to dig the first spade of earth, publicly states that there is only one person who should have "this honor"; he calls Alicia to take the shovel. Only a smattering of applause accompanies her introduction.

Alicia attempts to renew her bond with Freddie: "Freddie, how about helping an old friend?" she asks. But Freddie is now wholly brainwashed by community sentiment: "You're not my friend," he says. "They found out about you." He approaches her, and shouts: "You're a Communist! You're a Communist! You're a Communist! You're a Communist!" Alicia suddenly and violently responds. "Stop it! Stop it! Stop it! Stop it!" she screams, as she slaps him with each repetition. The scene emotionally drains the viewer.
Both Alicia and Freddie are victims of the anti-Communist wave, and the audience is tied up by the emotional confrontation.

The final segment of the film flashes between the darkened library area, where Freddie sits on the dedication platform, pondering recent events, and various scenes of intense conversation. In the first, Freddie's parents argue over the subject of culture. The father detests artistic creation (he refers to his wife's piano playing as "noise") and the fact that Freddie has never been an athlete, while Freddie's mother resents the fact that her spouse is acultural and unsympathetic to the sensitivity of little Freddie. In the second, Martha Lockridge discusses the homogeneous nature of the townspeople and her guilt with Mr. Duncan: "Look around you. All the nice normal people going about their nice normal business. I got a better job and you got a platform. What do you think it was...patriotism?" Mr. Duncan defends his stance: "It's a war, and we better win it. Sure, some innocent people are gonna get hurt..." But according to Roberts (and the film maker), even one is not an acceptable number of casualties, as this council member states: "I'm not afraid of Communism. I'm afraid of that kind of talk. I forgot what country I live in. Every citizen should be concerned. I hope I never forget that again." Here is the message of the movie: every citizen is responsible and obligated to defend the integrity of fellow Americans, even if she/he does not support the views of the majority. Moral integrity is the scale of judgement.

In the final scene, Freddie is pictured running through the library, in the midst of a fire which he has set. He hits his head and is knocked unconscious. The fire department rescues the small child, as the town
gathers to watch the library burn.

Numerous books and volume sets (Gulliver's Travels, Alice in Wonderland, various works of philosophy and psychology, Dickens creations, Tolstoy novels, a religious section, and finally, a book entitled The Story of Jesus) are pictured disappearing into cinders. "I had a bad dream, Mom," says Freddie to his mother, as he is returned to her protection. The little boy was transformed into a crazed vandal by the intolerance of the community. He has now finally awakened from his dreamworld, as has the town. Martha Lockridge and Mr. Duncan appear on the scene: "Go on, tell me again, Paul, nothing so terrible has happened. A little boy has been turned into a lunatic. It's not nice, normal people who set fires; it's lunatics," says Martha. Mr. Duncan suggests that they have a drink. But Martha delivers the final blow to their relationship: "I don't want to be engaged to a rising young politician," she says. "I'd rather crawl into a hole somewhere."

The minister, representative of religion and God, apologizes to Alicia: "Mrs. Hull, you know about the boy. It's not just him. We're all to blame." Alicia responds with renewed conviction: "I'm to blame, too. I didn't fight back." The reverend asks Alicia not to leave town, but rather to remain and help rebuild the library. She asserts the final resolve of the movie: "I won't [leave]. If anyone tries to remove a book again, they'll have to do it over my dead body."

Storm Center shows the manner in which audience opinion can be swayed by the mass medium of film. Despite the fact that Alicia might indeed have been involved in Communist activities, the audience gives her
the benefit of the doubt, and trusts, on her word, that she was never a truly committed Party member. This is because she is portrayed as being a quiet and friendly older woman, sincere in her beliefs and willing to fight alone (no Party support is visible) for a just cause. Never a Communist stooge, Alicia is a thinking individual. The intellectual is coupled with the emotional in this pleasant character, and the audience realizes that one might be a member of the "Council for Better Relations with the Soviet Union," "American Peace Mobilization," and the like, without being an avowed atheist and subversive.

In fact, Mrs. Hull represents religion in this production, as she encourages Freddie to read Stories from the Bible, and goes so far as to give him an inscribed library copy. The only other representative of religion in the movie, the minister, supports Alicia at the town meeting, and apologizes on behalf of the entire community at the end of the film. When the books are burned, the film maker showed classics and religious stories being destroyed. Therefore, censorship is shown for its potential to become extreme, and the audience realizes the desired message calling for literary freedom.

Stereotypes attempt to compensate for the inaccuracies of past films. Freddie's mother enjoys playing the piano and attending cultural events; she is emotionally close to her sensitive and non-athletic child, while Freddie's father is an anti-Communist (he uses the terms "Commie" and "pinko") discourages intellectual pursuits (at one point, he damages Stories from the Bible, as he rips it out of Freddie's hands during an evening meal), and looks to mold Freddie into something he is not (in one
scene, during which Freddie's father visits this meddling librarian who has befriended his child, Mrs. Hull actually scolds him for his lack of compassion and the fact that he imposes impossible demands on his little son: "Stop wishing he was someone else," she says. "We care too much about conformity in this country").

The representatives of government, as embodied in the city council, are shown to be simplistic in their decision-making, insecure about and wholly dedicated to their own careers, out of touch with the specifics of issues like Communism and freedom of the press, and unsympathetic to the needs of individuals. Paul Duncan, leader of the council, drinks alcohol and smokes cigarettes, characteristics of the "bad guy" in anti-Communist films. This movie reverses roles, as the anti-Communists are now the villains, and the individuals defending unpopular ideals are the heroes. While the production does not commit itself to defending Communists, it does allow for the right to differing opinions and individual choice.

*Dr. Strangelove*

(1964; Columbia Pictures; Director: Stanley Kubrick)

Although Stanley Kubrick created this feature length satire long after the McCarthy era had ended, *Dr. Strangelove* is still worthy of mention, as it comments upon both the contemporary causes of anti-Communist sentiment, as well as the past sources of anti-Soviet propaganda and derision. The film is both humorous and troubling, as it parodies the
military mind and the concept of a "winnable" nuclear conflict between the superpowers.

Subtitled "How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb," this movie reverses the practice of hiring obscure actors for political roles, as the production is a virtual showcase of respected talent. The opening credits roll over the backdrop of a mid-air B-52 refueling; a light, melodious tune plays in the background. Kubrick juxtaposes the potential for violence with a carefree accompaniment in order to highlight the simple-minded attitude that many Americans take toward international relations and military defense.

The characterizations of the film are exaggerated, as is the bizarre plot. But they do not wander too far from the essence of the communicative rift that actually exists between the United States and the Soviet Union. Character names and the idiosyncratic actions of the performers are amusing, but again symbolic of the immature nature of military policy and the nightmarish battle for nuclear superiority.

The plot, in brief, evolves this way: The Soviet Union has developed a doomsday device which guarantees the destruction of the entire planetary surface if it is ever attacked by a nuclear device. Psychologically imbalanced United States Army General Jack Ripper spontaneously takes it upon himself to order a group of B-52s to attack the Soviet Union under Wing Attack Plan "R." Since this particular base commander is the only person who can override the "go [attack] code," and all other communication between the pilots and the United States has been ordered shut down by the deranged military man, a war between the United States
and the Soviet Union appears imminent. Informed of the disaster, the President of the United States, Murkin Muffly, attempts to take control of the base by dispatching a small military unit to quell the military coup. But Ripper has already ordered his men to defend the area at all costs, and most of the soldiers on both sides are killed in the ensuing battle.

The President next contacts Soviet Premier Kissoff, who is in the middle of a party and slightly intoxicated, and warns him of the impending crisis. He even offers to help shoot down the U.S. aircraft, if necessary. Eventually, through a concerted effort, all but one of the planes is recalled or destroyed. But this one aircraft does manage to get through, and, after extensive, bordering on slapstick, trouble with the bomb bay doors, inevitably drops its payload, with the overzealous Southern captain of the B-52 riding the nuclear device down like a bronco.

The film ends with the image of innumerable nuclear explosions mushrooming the Earth into oblivion, as a woman sentimentally sings the nostalgic tune, "We'll Meet Again." The audience feels empty, both from near uninterrupted laughter, as well as intellectual nausea. They simultaneously realize the idiocy of the Armageddon arms race, anti-Communist rhetoric, and unchecked military control. American-Soviet co-existence is too complex a relationship to simply be treated as a black-and-white competition for power. The audience leaves the theater troubled, and psychologically broadened to the fact that there are ideological intricacies (to Communism, Capitalism, etc.) as well as literal complications (the plane is an electrician's nightmare) contained
within "the conflict." They also realize that fallible human beings control the fate of humanity, and are thus de-numbed of their blind confidence in the American government.

The stereotypes of this film are the source of its success. General Turgesson, portrayed by George C. Scott, is a warmongering member of the President's staff. His scantily clad secretary is also his girlfriend; he treats her like a small child: "Of course it isn't only physical," he says to her during a phone conversation in the middle of all the controversy. "Of course I respect you as a human being. Now don't forget to say your prayers." He is a lovesick puppy in charge of the U.S. Army. Turgesson is the definitive anti-Communist officer, referring to the enemy as "commies," and getting excited at the prospect of a potential war: "On the other hand," he says, "if we launch an all out attack, we'd have a chance of catching them with their pants down, with only modest, acceptable civilian casualties." National security is in the hands of this domination-oriented, irresponsible "kid." But the President refreshes the general's memory: "It is the policy of our country not to attack first." The film brings out the existence of the "acceptable losses" mentality, and shows a man of great influence expressing his deep desire to defeat the Communist menace. The message: don't trust authority, and particularly the military, as it immaturely lusts after superiority and ignores the importance, indeed, the relevance, of humanity.

General Jack Ripper is the man who orchestrates the debacle. He looks to destroy the Soviet Union, because of a somewhat unorthodox Communist plot: "I won't allow Communist indoctrination, infiltration, and
subversion to sap and impurity all of our precious bodily fluids. . . . Did you [British officer Mandrake, unwilling assistant to the General] ever hear of fluoridation? Did you know that fluoridation is the most monsterously conceived Commie plot?" The paranoia which typifies anti-Communism comes out in this frightened analysis of Soviet policy. The President knows that Ripper is insane, but the airtight system of security makes it too late to rectify the situation. He calls the Premier, and explains the major "inconvenience": "One of our base commanders went a little funny in the head.... he did a silly thing." This is casual and adolescent talk about a global and exceedingly serious situation. It is two children discussing the future of their play area. With his scathing caricatures, Kubrick exhibits the utter lack of maturity and progress that is evoked by military competition and deliberately cold and insincere U.S.-Soviet relations.

Buck, the pilot of the B-52, portrayed by Slim Pickens, is a Southern hick whose main purpose in life is to serve his country. When the order to bomb the Soviet Union is first delivered, he thinks that perhaps the command is some sort of loyalty test. But when he realizes that it is a legitimate command, he puts on his cowboy hat and solemnly executes the standard procedures. Separate orders are distributed to each member of the crew, and survival kits, which include a miniature Russian phrase book/Bible (an odd combination, to say the least) are doled out. Pickens actually looks forward to the challenge of war, as if it were a superpower rodeo competition, and he the captain of the American team.

Peter Sellers is the most versatile performer, as he portrays several different characters in the film. The fact that he plays more than one role
expresses the universal guilt of all those involved in the story. No one in this film is beyond reproach, because each character embodies some form of stubbornness and immaturity. Verbal exchange is on a grade school level. First, Sellers is British Colonel Mandrake, a soldier who is trying to calm General Ripper, and persuade him to divulge the secret recall code. He is Ripper's sounding board and sole confidante. For this reason, he is the film's most stable character, as he foils the General's unbalanced nature. Secondly, Sellers is U.S. President Murkin Muffy--again, a comparatively stable character, but unable to rectify the grave situation, and incapable of raising the level of communication between the Soviet Union and the United States to an intelligent level.

Finally, Sellers plays the role of the movie's title character, Dr. Strangelove, a man in charge of America's Department of Scientific Research and Development. Strangelove is portrayed as a mad, Nazi scientist, formerly devoted to Adolph Hitler, and now committed to any authority which will allow him to carry on his evil practices. The character resembles the stereotypic villains from anti-Communist films of the fifties. He is confined to a wheelchair; but this disability only makes him appear to be more mechanical and sinister. He has tossed hair, sports a thin black moustache, smokes cigarettes, laughs with a diabolical cackle, and wears dark gloves. Strangelove speaks of a viable solution to the impending vaporization of the Earth's surface: "[We can] preserve the nucleus of a human in deep mines," he says, "and stay down for 100 years. It would not be difficult, mein fuhrer . . . sorry, Mr. President." Dr. Strangelove has a difficult time keeping his arm down in Nazi salute. He
is an evil and destructive character, a criminal from Germany's past, and yet his integrity and outrageous suggestion are valued by the President and his military advisors and underlings. Strangelove further suggests that the ratio of women to men in the mines will have to be approximately 10-1, so that the population can quickly multiply. Military men are to be the predominant representatives beneath the Earth's surface, "to pass on the tradition." This is a highly effective and worthwhile plan, according to those military minds present, although General Turgesson worries about a potential "mine shaft gap" between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. Here, again, is a demonstration of the fact that those who run the country (at least in this film, and possibly, to some extent, in reality) are mainly sexually motivated, inordinately competitive, war-loving men.

The film parodies anti-Communist films by attempting to instill a patriotic fervor which incessantly falls flat because of the movie's mocking tone, as expressed through several aspects of each scene. For example, whenever the attacking B-52 is pictured in flight, it is always mockingly accompanied by a quiet but stirring chorus humming "When Johnny Comes Marching Home" to a steady drum beat. Inside the plane, Captain Buck's eagerness to attack the Soviets is enough to make nearly the most patriotic American queasy.

The Soviet Union is also parodied, as the ambassador from that country is constantly taking pictures of the War Room (which he was allowed to enter in order to resolve the nuclear crisis), and the country's Premier is shown to be a drunkard who throws wild parties at the Kremlin. Neither side deserves unflinching trust and admiration.
The film refuses to take government seriously, because it sees the missile gap between the United States and the Soviet Union to be negligible; unworthy of avid pursuit and extensive funds. The film also shows the military to be a hypocritical "peace-keeping" outfit just waiting for the chance to fight. (During the attack on the U.S. base by American troops, the viewer watches men die in front of an army billboard which reads: "Peace in our profession").

Syereotypes abound; but the movie also warns the viewer not to be too paranoid, nor to assign simple-mindedly evil characteristics to any individual or political belief (particularly Communism), because the American structure is, in many ways, equally conniving and dangerous. For example, the film warns against the careful appeal made by anti-Communists to the protective nature of American adults for their children. Ripper exhibits this cheap strategy: "There are [Communist] studies underway to fluoridate flour. . . ice cream, children's ice cream." When the viewer witnesses this crazed military man expressing the "protect the future of our youth" argument, they realize the slanted foolishness of the stance. Don't Russians have children, too? Don't they eat ice cream?

Generally, Dr. Strangelove presents the first official sign that the institutionalized period of anti-Communism was over (at least in the film industry) as the audience was encouraged to laugh at themselves in a reflective and conscientious manner. Ripper is religious and feels that he will be able to justify his actions in the next world: "I believe in a life after this one, and I'll have to answer for this. I think I can." Kubrick
warns the audience that if they believe in an afterlife, then they too will have to answer for the actions of their country and themselves. He advises people to be wary of their own government, and to reflect on the hypocrisy of both superpowers, as they evaluate their personal beliefs and statements of support.
CONCLUSION—LESSONS WE SHOULD NEVER FORGET

What can be learned from the transitional and traumatic McCarthy era? One might convincingly argue that the United States has learned from its mistake and will not again tolerate such institutionalized political persecution. And yet, contemporary America is indeed in the midst of an ongoing Red Scare, as international policy is continually shaped and executed in opposition to Soviet presence and ideological difference. The government perpetuates the idea that America is the definitive "good" fighting for aspiring democracies. The evil Soviet hordes, according to this attitude, must be confronted and kept from dominating the West.

This is not to say that the Soviet government does not pose a threat to the security and self-determination of various countries, but rather that the United States government puts forward a "holier than thou" mindset, which places America under the category of crusading, selfless protector of the oppressed. This is more inaccurate than most Americans know or would care to admit.

Margaret Chase Smith noticed and emphatically spoke against the institutionalized denial of idealistic freedom, from the very outset; and yet the injustices still came to pass. Debate and analyses came from every mass communications medium, and yet the audience, the American people, was generally in support of Joseph McCarthy or held no opinion whatsoever.

The film industry acquiesced, and produced dramatic movies which were intended to instill a patriotic ideology, and an intense concern for
internal security. Stereotypes, inaccuracies, tense music, and subliminal tricks were employed to achieve the desired anti-Communist ends. It reflected the power of political influence on the media—even the mass entertainment media. Individuals reacted with paranoia to the "loyalty" hearings, in producing factually inaccurate films which would display nationalism. Despite the fact that these films were unpopular, their very existence show the extent to which the anti-Communist craze shook America, and the limits to which people were willing to compromise themselves for career security. Blacklisting and job discrimination were likely hazards for accused citizens. Thus a choice was made, oftentimes in favor of submission and overt expressions of loyalty.

The films themselves instilled the paranoia which typified the era. Falsehoods, just like those expressed by McCarthy in the Tydings and subsequent committee hearings, were viewed as allowable incongruities, necessary in the struggle to concentrate national attention and support. The films were aesthetically underdeveloped and justifiably unpopular. Political subject films were considered unappealing at face value; but the message was delivered, as these ideology shapers were aired as opening features on double bills. They exemplified the insecurity of the period, both in the fact that they were chiefly produced under pressure, and in the nervous characteristics assigned to those portraying card-carrying Communists.

The movies were an appeal to patriotic and protective emotions, as Communist threats were directed toward that which was familiar, and held dear, in America—the family (particularly "Mom" and children),
religion, and education. They aroused the curiosity of the audience toward particular characters, and then confirmed the viewers' suspicions, urging them to be cautious in everyday life toward actual suspected Communists. They inspired a patriotism of fear and sentimentality. Conversely, the films also encouraged the viewer to trust the policing authority and secretive practices of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and to place the security of America and patriotic loyalty even over familial ties. Communism was associated with sin and Godlessness, while anti-Communism was portrayed as a holy crusade. Later reactionary films even encouraged citizens to question authority and rely upon individual judgement.

This form of propaganda is still evident today, as exhibited by the creation of the scenario movie *Red Dawn*, a production which imagines the consequences of a Soviet/Cuban invasion on the heartland of the United States. The fear of outside intervention and Communist takeover is still a viable theme; the potential for regression, to the point at which anti-Soviet mass media creations are produced, is still present, although chiefly untapped.

The common thread, which seems to dominate each aspect of the McCarthy era, and particularly the man himself, is insecurity. Joseph McCarthy was a political aspirant who was less ideologically motivated than he was in search of popularity and public acceptance. His numerous episodes of hypocrisy, inconsistency, and flagrant lying show that he was not merely a politician, seeking support for his programs and ideas, but rather that he was a fallible human being desperately in search of
widespread notoriety.

In a certain sense, the political system of the United States fostered McCarthy's actions. Both the anti-Communist and the anti-McCarthy fronts were thoroughly unwilling to discuss their particular arguments. In point of fact, the Cold War even evolved into a game of personalities, with accused Americans hanging in the balance. This is, in many respects, the dangerous "nature" of politics. Public image is maintained through staunch belief and oftentimes feigned security. That is, many constituents judge their representatives on the basis of the candidate's specific stances on personal and controversial issues, the confidence and past record of the individual, and/or the image conveyed by advertisements and the media. Thus, elections are, in large part, based on imprecise criteria. McCarthy knew how to work this political system to his advantage, at least in the state of Wisconsin, and to instill a confidence which he did not possess himself.

McCarthy derived his security and peace of mind from a skewed sense of popularity. Being liked informally by all people with whom he came into contact, including those he openly criticized, was an imperative priority for McCarthy. But the Senator also realized that he had numerous critics, himself. Thus, he didn't seem to mind publicized condemnation, as it at least afforded him mass recognition. McCarthy regarded this opposition as a necessary cross to bear in his struggle to keep America "free."

Many of McCarthy's critics missed the mark in their specific objections. Even the United States Senate did not ultimately recognize McCarthy's most heinous crime. When the Senator from Wisconsin was
finally brought down off his long-immunized pedestal, he was not reprimanded for persecuting innocent Americans, who merely held different political beliefs in a culture where belief is an inalienable right. McCarthy's censure centered about the disrespect he showed for his fellow Senate members:

Resolved. That the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. McCarthy, failed to cooperate with the [Gillette] Committee in clearing up matters referred to that committee which concerned his conduct as a Senator... and instead repeatedly abused the committee and its members who were trying to carry out assigned duties, thereby obstructing the constitutional processes of the Senate, and that this conduct... was contrary to Senatorial traditions and is hereby condemned.

Sec. 2. The Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. McCarthy, in characterizing the [Select Committee] as the "unwitting handmaiden," "involuntary agent," and "attorneys in fact" of the Communist Party... 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. ¹

Possibly the U.S. Senate did this in order to free itself from public outcry. McCarthy was not the only anti-Communist in the Congress; he was merely the most vociferous and adamant. Thus, in the words of Herbert Lehman, "[w]e [had] condemned the individual, but we [had] not yet repudiated the 'ism.'"² While the censure was necessary, its content did
not state that the Senate would not again tolerate the denial of "freedom of belief" to the citizens of the United States. The fact that the McCarthy reign lasted so long and was supported by so many people, both officially and informally, shows that it was not just his period, it was indeed many American's era.

The belief in Communism was unjustly and institutionally banned in the United States. While all American members of the Party might not have been fully aware of the actions of Joseph Stalin and the country to which they felt an affinity, they did hold an ideology which they considered to be admirable, especially during America's awkward Cold War transition:

And it is now sad to read the anti-Communist writers and intellectuals of those times. But sad is a fake word for me to be using; I am still angry that their reason for disagreeing with McCarthy was too often his crude methods-- the standards of the board of governors of a country club. Such people would have a right to say that I, and many like me, took too long to see what was going on in the Soviet Union. But whatever our mistakes, I do not believe we did our country any harm. And I think they did.... Many of the anti-Communists were, of course, honest men. But none of them, as far as I know, has stepped forward to admit a mistake. It is not necessary in this country; they too know that we are a people who do not remember much.

Lillian Hellman encapsulates the period quite well with this
statement. America is an ever-diversifying nation which continually realizes innumerable controversies and newsworthy events. Thus, the American people quickly disregard past occurrences and adroitly move and adjust to new situations. This was indeed an odd episode in American history; but the fact that few or no public apologies took place, that Communists are still, in essence, a detested people in America (albeit less visibly and formally), and in fact, that McCarthy still receives accolades from certain contemporary figures, shows that the atrocities of the period have generally been forgotten. And yet this was an era in which Constitutional liberties were denied—a most heinous crime, particularly in America. This does not reflect well on national integrity. But then, Americans, like McCarthy, are human, and must guard their own sense of self-worth and morality. The McCarthy era is hardly a positive aspect of American history and more easily considered a past experience with "unbridled evil."

Most importantly, we must realize that Senator Joseph R. McCarthy was not alone in his quest to rid America of "Communist subversives." He had many ideological supporters—some, like certain members of the film industry, partially coerced, and some wholeheartedly in agreement with his ideals and/or practices. It was not an era in which one deranged individual came to power by some political fluke, and passed out of public influence after the nation came to its senses. It was a period in which an insecure, fame-driven human being caught hold of the predominant sentiment in the country and turned it into a successful campaign which centered on the institutionalized persecution of innocent Americans.
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