

What Impact did Joseph McCarthy have on the Red Scare? – Part One: McCarthy's Accusations

Background

First elected as a U.S. Senator from Wisconsin in 1946, few noticed Joseph McCarthy during his first three years in the Senate. All that changed when in February 1950 he made a bombshell speech. Addressing the Republican Women's Club of Wheeling, West Virginia, he announced that he had evidence that in spite of the Truman administration's efforts to eliminate disloyal elements from government service, 205 members of the Communist Party continued to work for the State Department.

It is likely that even McCarthy himself was surprised at the public reaction to his revelations. In the past two years the United States had watched as China had become a communist country, the Soviet Union successfully tested an atomic bomb, and North Korea launched an invasion of South Korea. America, which had seemed the world's dominant power in 1945, felt its position slipping away, and McCarthy's accusations provided a convenient explanation.

The Senate, therefore, was inclined to look into these charges, and a committee was soon set up under Maryland Democrat Millard Tydings. The charges, Tydings concluded, were without foundation, but few were paying attention. Three days after the Maryland senator publicly rejected McCarthy's accusations Julius Rosenberg was arrested for passing atomic secrets to the Soviet Union. The issue of Soviet penetration of the U.S. government seemed shockingly real. As for Tydings, when he stood for reelection later that year McCarthy and his allies accused him of being "soft on communism." Marylanders took the charge seriously—Tydings, who had been in the Senate since 1927, was defeated.

The message sent by the Tydings defeat was clear—it was dangerous to stand in the way of Joe McCarthy. For the next two years the accusations flew, and quite a few Democrats (and even some Republicans, such as Margaret Chase Smith of Maine, who dared criticize the senator from Wisconsin) found themselves accused of being "communist sympathizers." In 1952, aided in part by McCarthy's accusations (but probably more so by the stalemated war in Korea), the Republican Party won control of both houses of Congress, while GOP candidate Dwight D. Eisenhower was elected president in a landslide.

In the short term at least, Republican dominance in Washington gave McCarthy new prestige and power. He was awarded the chair of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, and used his position to subpoena a series of government employees. His accusations did not remain limited to the State Department. Soon employees of Voice of America, and even officers and enlisted men of the U.S. Army, were called before McCarthy's committee and accused of being at best naïve dupes of communism, and at worst traitors to their country.

In the long run, however, Republican control of Congress and the White House led to McCarthy's downfall. Many Republicans had privately expressed doubts about McCarthy's reckless accusations, but had remained silent when his targets were Democrats. Among these was Eisenhower himself, who had refused even to defend his former Army colleague George C. Marshall when McCarthy suggested that he was a subversive. However, after 1952 the Wisconsin Senator was becoming more and more of an embarrassment to the GOP. When in 1953 he began to suggest that communists had infiltrated the Army, Eisenhower went on the attack, issuing an order forbidding any member of his administration from testifying before McCarthy's committee.

The final straw came in 1954, when the Army accused McCarthy and his chief lieutenant, Roy Cohn, of pressuring the Army into giving preferential treatment to Cohn's friend G. David Schine. Now it was McCarthy himself who was on the hot seat, and in the resulting Army-McCarthy Hearings, broadcast on nationwide television, the Wisconsin Senator came across as a common bully. Meanwhile, the Army's chief counsel, Joseph N. Welch, finally shamed him with the famous words, "Have you no sense of decency, sir?" In December 1954 he was formally censured by the Senate, which put an end to his investigations once and for all. A painful chapter in America's history had at last come to its close.

Activity 1 – McCarthy’s Accusations

Read through Sources 1-4 and answer the following questions as you go. Be prepared to discuss next lesson:

Question	Answer
1. What information did McCarthy cite to show that America was losing the war against Communism?	
2. Explain what McCarthy meant when he said, <i>‘When a great democracy is destroyed, it will not be from enemies from without, but rather because of enemies from within.’</i>	
3. How did McCarthy describe the sorts of people engaged in ‘traitorous actions’ in the United States?	
4. What did Truman mean when he claimed that McCarthy was an ‘asset’ to the Kremlin?	
5. According to Truman, how did McCarthy fit in with the overall strategy of the Republican Party?	
6. Evaluate the five statements by the Republican senators. What was their purpose in issuing these statements?	
7. In your opinion, how did partisanship fighting between the Republicans and Democrats interfere with the issue at hand?	
8. How does the political cartoon by Herblock portray McCarthy? Why do you think he chose to portray McCarthy this way?	

Source 1 – Excerpts from Speech of Joseph McCarthy, Wheeling, West Virginia, February 9th 1950: <http://historymatters.gmu.edu/d/6456>

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

Six years ago, there was within the Soviet orbit, 180,000,000 people. Lined up on the antitotalitarian side there were in the world at that time, roughly 1,625,000,000 people. Today, only six years later, there are 80,000,000,000 people under the absolute domination of Soviet Russia—an increase of over 400 percent. On our side, the figure has shrunk to around 500,000. In other words, in less than six years, the odds have changed from 9 to 1 in our favor to 8 to 1 against us.

This indicates the swiftness of the tempo of Communist victories and American defeats in the cold war. As one of our outstanding historical figures once said, “When a great democracy is destroyed, it will not be from enemies from without, but rather because of enemies from within.” [..]

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

This is glaringly true in the State Department. There the bright young men who are born with silver spoons in their mouths are the ones who have been most traitorous...

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

As you know, very recently the Secretary of State proclaimed his loyalty to a man guilty of what has always been considered as the most abominable of all crimes—being a traitor to the people who gave him a position of great trust—high treason....

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

Source 2 - Excerpt from President Truman's News Conference at Key West, March 30, 1950: <http://historymatters.gmu.edu/d/6456>

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

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

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

The President. Now let me give you a little preliminary, and then I will tell you what I think you ought to do. Let me tell you what the situation is. We started out in 1945, when I became President, and the two wars were still going on, and the Russians were our allies, just the same as the British and the French and Brazil and the South American countries. And we won the war together....

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

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

In 1947 I instituted a loyalty program for Government employees, and that loyalty procedure program was set up in such a way that the rights of individuals were respected. In a survey of the 2,200,000 employees at that time, I think there were some 205—something like that—who left the service. I don't know—a great many of them left of their own accord....

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

Now, if anybody really felt that there were disloyal people in the employ of the Government, the proper and the honorable way to handle the situation would be to come to the President of the United States and say, "This man is a disloyal person. He is in such and such a department." We will investigate him immediately, and if he were a disloyal person he would be immediately fired. That is not what they want. They are trying to create an issue, and it is going to be just as big a fiasco as the campaign in New York and other places on these other false and fatuous issues.

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

Q. What would it be, Mr. President?

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

Source 3 - Statement of Seven Republican Senators, June 1, 1950:

<http://historymatters.gmu.edu/d/6459>

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

Source 4 - "I Have Here in my Hand..." (Cartoon):

<http://www.loc.gov/rr/print/swann/herblock/images/s03479u.jpg>



"I have here in my hand. . ." May 7, 1954. Ink, graphite, opaque white, and overlay over graphite underdrawing on layered paper. Published in the *Washington Post* (34) [LC-USZ62-126910](https://www.loc.gov/rr/print/swann/herblock/images/s03479u.jpg)

What Impact did Joseph McCarthy have on the Red Scare?

Part Two: Eisenhower and McCarthy

Activity 2 – Eisenhower and McCarthy

You should have been divided into two groups by your teacher. Read the 9 Sources below and use them to either defend or oppose the following proposition:

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

As you read each source, try to make a list or bullet-point notes of points that you could raise either in defense or opposition to the proposition.

Source 1 - "You Mean I'm Supposed to Stand on That?" (Cartoon):

<http://www.loc.gov/exhibits/herblock/naughty-naughty.html>



"You Mean I'm Supposed to Stand on That?" 1950. Graphite, ink, and opaque white over graphite underdrawing. Published in the *Washington Post*, March 29, 1950. Loan courtesy of The Washington Post Company (29.00.00)

Source 2 - "Nothing Exceeds like Excess" (Cartoon):

<http://www.loc.gov/exhibits/herblocks-history/fire.html>



Nothing exceeds like excess,

September 12, 1952. Ink, graphite, and opaque white over graphite underdrawing on layered paper.

Published in the *Washington Post*

(32) [LC-USZ62-126909](https://www.loc.gov/ead/USZ62-126909)

Source 3 - "Have a Care, Sir" (Cartoon): <http://www.loc.gov/exhibits/herblocks-history/fire.html>



"Have a care, sir," March 4, 1954. Reproduction from original drawing. Published in the *Washington Post* (33)

Source 4 - Excerpt from draft of Eisenhower speech given on October 3, 1952 in Milwaukee, Wisconsin on "Communism and Freedom":

www.eisenhower.utexas.edu/dl/McCarthy/sixthdraftDDEW/campaignspeech.pdf

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

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

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

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

Source 5 - Excerpt from a letter from President Eisenhower to his friend, Harry Bullis, May 18, 1953:

<http://www.eisenhower.archives.gov/dl/McCarthy/DDEtoBullis51853pg1.pdf>

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

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

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

Source 6 - Excerpt from a letter from President Eisenhower to his brother, Milton Eisenhower, October 9, 1953:

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

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

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

Source 7 - Excerpts from notes from the day by C.D. Jackson, Speechwriter and Special Assistant to the President, November 27, 1953:

<http://www.eisenhower.archives.gov/dl/McCarthy/CDJacksonNotesfromday112753pg1.pdf>

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

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

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

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

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

Source 8 - Excerpts from notes from the day by C.D. Jackson, Speechwriter and Special Assistant to the President, November 30, 1953:

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

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

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

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

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

Source 9 - Excerpt from Memorandum, Stanley M. Rumbough, Jr. and Charles Masterson, Special Assistants in the White House, to Murray Snyder, Assistant White House Press Secretary, about responding to Senator McCarthy, December 1, 1953:
<http://www.eisenhower.archives.gov/dl/McCarthy/Rumbaughmemo12153pg1.pdf>

I. MAIN POINTS FOR CONSIDERATION

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

II. SUPPLEMENTARY FACTS

- A. Image of the President as an inspirational leader is important to the independent voter, who provided the margin of victory in the last election. These men and women did not vote for the Republican Party; they voted for Eisenhower. If their image of the President becomes clouded and if they do not vote again as they did in the last election, no amount of effort by the Republican Party will bring success.
- B. The threat to the legislative program is highly questionable. There are qualified observers who say that McCarthy and his coterie will neither drag their feet nor vote with the Democrats in the event the President speaks out against McCarthyism. Furthermore, there is no assurance that appeasement now will insure the legislative program. It is apparent that Senator McCarthy acts exclusively in the interest of Senator McCarthy, and if he deems it good strategy to discredit Eisenhower by scuttling the legislative program he will do so, whether or not the President speaks out against McCarthyism.
- C. People are swayed by emotion more than reason. And this is an emotional issue. Furthermore, the image of the president as a fighter may well be more important politically than the success or failure of a legislative program (assuming that success or failure of the program is involved).
- D. One of the most dramatic moments in the President's career has arrived. He can appeal to the people now as a popular leader who has been attacked. Further, in speaking out against McCarthyism he is on the side of the angels. He can answer McCarthyism in the spirit of fair play and in the very words of the founding fathers, the Bill of Rights, Washington and Lincoln.

III. SUGGESTED ACTION

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

This Administration is determined to keep the people informed. We have been charged on the one hand with harboring Communists and on the other hand with playing politics in our program of cleaning Communists out. The record of this Administration is open to public view—and it is a record we are and will be proud of. As I have stated before, the era in which we live is dominated by the threat of world domination by the forces of Communism. If our way of life is to be preserved, we must be alert to that threat. Blindness or poor judgment in detecting Communist influence in our government is as dangerous as excesses in the other direction.

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

Source 10 - Excerpts from notes from the day by C.D. Jackson, Speechwriter and Special Assistant to the President, December 2, 1953:

<http://www.eisenhower.archives.gov/dl/McCarthy/CDJacksonDec21953.pdf>

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

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

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

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

What Impact did Joseph McCarthy have on the Red Scare?

Part Three: The Fall of Joseph McCarthy

Activity 3 – The Fall of Joseph McCarthy

Read through the following documents. After you have done so, write 1-2 paragraphs explaining how the events described might have contributed to McCarthy's downfall. Be prepared to share this paragraph with the class.

Source 1 - Excerpt from diary entry by James C. Hagerty, White House Press Secretary, February 25, 1954:

<http://www.eisenhower.archives.gov/dl/McCarthy/DiaryTypedHagertyFeb2554.pdf>

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

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

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

Source 2 - Excerpt from diary entry by James Hagerty, March 10, 1954:

<http://www.eisenhower.archives.gov/dl/McCarthy/DiaryentryMarch1054.pdf>

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

Source 3 - Excerpt from diary entry by James Hagerty, May 14, 1954:

<http://www.eisenhower.archives.gov/dl/McCarthy/Diaryentry51454.pdf>

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

Source 4 - Excerpts from diary entry by James Hagerty, May 17, 1954:

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

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

Source 5 - Excerpts from diary entry by Press Secretary James Hagerty, May 28, 1954:

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

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

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

The President then sat down at his desk and said that he supposed he will be asked this question at his press conference. I said I was sure it would come up. He said, “Make sure it does because I’ll tell you now what I’m going to say—I am going to tell the newsmen that in my opinion this is the most arrogant invitation to subversion and disloyalty that I have ever heard of. I am going to also say that if such an invitation is accepted by any employee of the Government and we find out who that employee is, he will be fired on the spot if a civilian and court martialled on the spot if a military man. I won’t stand for it for one minute.”

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

Source 6 – Senate Resolution 301: Censure of Senator Joseph McCarthy, 1954

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

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

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

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