

THE  
HANOVER  
HISTORICAL  
REVIEW



Volume 10  
2009



Above: Herblock [Herbert Block], *The Washington Post Co.*, 1954. Courtesy of the Archives at Hanover College.

## GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPTS

Manuscripts, prepared in conformity with *The Chicago Manual of Style*, 14th ed., should be submitted in three typed copies. Also helpful are PC-compatible submissions, particularly in Microsoft Word. As manuscripts are evaluated anonymously, the author's name should appear on the title page only.

Articles will be edited to conform to HHR style in matters of grammar. The editors seek to consult authors on all changes in the interest of clarity and economy of expression. The editors are the final arbiters of length, grammar, and usage.

The HHR disclaims responsibility for statements, either as fact or opinion, made by contributors.

The Hanover Historical Review is a student-edited publication initiated by students in 1992. The journal accepts papers of a historical nature from a variety of disciplines.

© 2009 THE HANOVER HISTORICAL REVIEW / Hanover College

# THE HANOVER HISTORICAL REVIEW

Volume 10

Spring 2009

## **Editor-in-Chief**

Margaret H. McAdams

## **Assistant Editors**

Sarah Carman Dylan Woods

## **Board of Editors**

Kirk Terrell Katharine Holmes Lindsay Rosa

## **Board of Advisory Editors**

Dr. Larry Thornton

*Professor of History*

Dr. Daniel P. Murphy

*Professor of History, Humanities Division Head*

## **Managing Editor**

Douglas Denné

*Archivist and Curator of Rare Books*

## **Special Contributors**

Dr. Sarah McNair Vosmeier

*Associate Professor of History*

Dr. Jeffrey Brautigam

*Associate Professor and Chair, Department of History*

## **Interior Layout and Cover Design**

Sandra Guthrie Matthew B. Maupin

## **Publisher**

Fineline Printing, Inc.

The HANOVER HISTORICAL REVIEW is dedicated to the promotion of excellence in undergraduate scholarship and writing.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## Student Submissions

Excerpt from “Irish Neutrality in World War II” by Matthew D. Sweeney .....	6
“Don’t Tread on U.S.” by Zachary E. Caress .....	9

## William Ezra Jenner

Foreword <i>By William Edward Jenner, Esq.</i> .....	26
Brief Biography of William Ezra Jenner <i>By Jaleh Fazelian and Douglas Denné</i> .....	27
“Let’s Put America First” <i>Introduction by Margaret McAdams</i> .....	29
Letters Received By William Jenner Regarding the Address of February 14 <i>Introduction by Dylan Woods and Margaret McAdams</i> .....	41
Letter from Robert Wright .....	41
Letter from Stella Lydick .....	42
Letter from Edith Storey .....	43
Letter from Austin Moser .....	45
Billions, Blunders and Baloney <i>Introduction by Margaret McAdams</i> .....	47
Letter from Joseph McCarthy to President Harry S. Truman <i>Introduction by Kirk Terrell</i> .....	49
Letters to Senator William Jenner, 1954 Dear Senator Letter, Los Angeles <i>Introduction by Dylan Woods</i> .....	54
Letter from Sylvia Sykora <i>Introduction by Sarah Carman</i> .....	55
Letter from G. Bacon .....	56
Statement of William Jenner <i>Introduction by Kirk Terrell</i> .....	58
Letters to The Post <i>Introduction by Lindsay Rosa</i> .....	62
Hurting Morale: Post Editorial .....	62
Card-Carrying Americans: Editorial .....	63

**Excerpt From “Irish Neutrality in World War II:  
Eamon de Valera’s Struggle to Protect Eire”  
An Independent Study**

*By Matthew D. Sweeney*

World War II is one of the most interesting periods of history for modern Americans. Of the many wars in which American soldiers have fought, it, along with perhaps the American War of Independence and the American Civil War, grips the minds of contemporary Americans. These were defining moments in the nation’s history: the war to found America, the war to maintain America, and the war to maintain World Liberty. Each war is uniquely remembered as being “justified” wars, or wars that America had to fight. For the case of the Second World War, America tried its best to remain at peace, and, although the U.S. Navy had started firing on German U-boats in the Atlantic a few months earlier, America only began to fight in earnest after being attacked by an authoritarian state. This World War was fought from the American point of view to save freedom, liberty, and democracy, from cruel totalitarian states. The American cause in this war was a righteous one, and those men who fought in it and the women who maintained the home-front are remembered as “the greatest generation.”<sup>1</sup> Though soldiers on both sides in the war, Allied and Axis, committed honorable and terrible acts, the Allied cause is generally remembered as good, and the Axis as evil.<sup>1</sup>

The American knowledge of World War II is largely limited to the largest powers of the Allied and Axis sides, but there is little knowledge among Americans of the smaller countries, and hardly any of those nations that stayed out of the war entirely. This study is a look at one of those small nations that did not fight in World War II: Ireland. Ireland is not an unfamiliar country to Americans. Many Americans are descendents of Irish people who immigrated to this nation during the nineteenth century, mostly to find work and to escape famine back home in Ireland. While there are a large number of Irish-Americans in the United States, Ireland is often only remembered once a year on March 17, as people stumble out into the streets to parade, drink, and celebrate St. Patrick<sup>2</sup> with a kiss for being Irish. However, Ireland, being so closely tied to American history and identity, should be remembered and studied in this country more often than once a year. This is an examination of Ireland that will mix the heritage that so many Americans derive from that island with the American interest in the Second World War: this is the study of Irish neutrality in World War II.

The Irish policy of neutrality was brought about and enforced by Prime Minister Éamon de Valera. The decision to stay out of the fighting in World War

---

<sup>1</sup> The largest Allied powers, though not the only ones, were The United Soviet Socialist Republics (Russia), Great Britain, The United States of America, and France. The largest Axis powers, though not the only ones, were Germany, Italy, and Japan.

<sup>2</sup> St. Patrick is the patron saint of Ireland. His feast day is on March 17 every year.

It was affected by the desire of de Valera and the Irish Government to protect the people of Ireland from the war. As de Valera saw it, the nations fighting the war had such powerful militaries, that if Ireland was to enter the conflict, it would stand little chance of having a large positive effect on the war, but it would also likely be overrun, decimated and occupied by one of the larger powers. Having faced past occupation by the powerful nation of Great Britain, and fearing the prospect of future occupation, de Valera wanted to stay apart from the conflict. This thinking from the perspective of such a small country is understandable. However, this does not explain one of Éamon de Valera's more interesting and confusing acts during the war.

In April 1945, as the war in Europe was coming to a close, two leaders of the belligerent countries passed away: Franklin D. Roosevelt, the President of the United States, and Adolf Hitler, the Chancellor of Germany. At the time, Roosevelt was one of the most admired and beloved men in the world, while Hitler was one of the most reviled. Éamon de Valera expressed his condolences to both the American and German Ambassadors in Dublin<sup>3</sup> over the loss of their leaders. While many people across the world expressed similar grief over the passing of President Roosevelt, hardly any lost sleep over losing Hitler. De Valera's expression of condolence to the German Ambassador was one of the most controversial and hated events in modern Irish history. De Valera certainly had no illusions about what the public reaction would be, and he actually expected that he would be highly criticized. Knowing full well what people would say, why would he do this? Was it his final "neutral" action before the end of the war? Was it in defiance of Ireland's ancient enemy, Britain, which fought against Germany in the war? With Ireland having only recently won freedom from Britain, was the act meant to show how truly independent Ireland had become? In fact, the most likely answer lies deeper in the tumultuous wartime relationship that de Valera had with the leaders of the Alliance and their foreign delegations in Ireland, as well as with the rather congenial relations that he had with the German Legation. It is probable that de Valera's condolences to the German Embassy in April, 1945, were due to his high regard for the German Ambassador, Dr. Edward Hempel, and for his antipathies toward the British Prime Minister, Winston Churchill, and the American Ambassador, David Gray.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Dublin, located in the middle of the eastern coast of the island, is the capital city of Ireland.

<sup>4</sup> Before I begin with this study, I would like to thank the two largest sources of aid in this endeavor to understand Ireland during the war years: Tim Pat Coogan and T. Ryle Dwyer. Without their previous studies in Irish history, much of this work would not have been possible.

## Bibliography

Boyce, D. G. *The Irish Question and British Politics, 1868-1996. 2nd ed.* New York, New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc., 1996.

Coogan, Timothy Patrick. *Ireland Since the Rising.* New York, New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1966.

Coogan, Tim Pat. *The IRA: A History.* Niwot, Colorado: Roberts Rinehart Publishers, 1994.

Dwyer, T. Ryle. *Strained Relations: Ireland at Peace and the USA at War, 1941-1945.* Totowa, New Jersey: Barnes and Noble Books, 1988.

De Valera, Éamon. *Ireland's Stand: Being a Selection of Speeches of Éamon de Valera During the War (1939-1945). 2nd ed.* Dublin, Ireland: M. H. Gill and Son, Ltd., October 1946.

Goodwin, Doris Kearns. *No Ordinary Time: Franklin & Eleanor Roosevelt: The Home Front in World War II.* New York, New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 1994.

Hull, Cordell. *The Memoirs of Cordell Hull, Volumes I & II.* New York, New York: The MacMillan Company, 1948.

Loewenheim, Francis L., Harold D. Langly, and Manfred Jonas, Editors. *Roosevelt and Churchill: Their Secret Wartime Correspondence.* New York: Saturday Review Press / E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., New York, 1975.

Severn, Bill. *Irish Statesman and Rebel: The Two Lives of Éamon de Valera.* New York: Ives Washburn, Inc., 1970.

Sweet, Paul R., Editor. *Documents on German Foreign Policy 1918-1945, Series C, Volumes VIII, X, and XII.* Washington, District of Columbia: United States Government Printing Office, 1957.

Wilkinson, James, and H. Stuart Hughes. *Contemporary Europe: A History 10th Edition.* New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2004.



## **“Don’t Tread on U.S.:**

### **The Impact of Federalism in the Formation of American Government” An Independent Study**

*By Zachary E. Caress*

In 1775, the first year of the American War for Independence, before the Declaration of Independence had been signed, Benjamin Franklin wrote an anonymous article to the American colonists that described the qualities of the infant nation. Franklin wrote in the *Pennsylvania Journal* on December 27, 1775, that “I observed on one of the drums belonging to the marines now raising, there was painted a Rattle-Snake, with this modest motto under it, ‘Don’t tread on me.’”<sup>5</sup> According to Franklin, the rattlesnake provided several fine examples of the unique American political philosophy and way of life. One of Franklin’s descriptions of the rattlesnake explained that the strength of America rested simultaneously in the fiercely independent nature of the states and the cooperative attitude of those same states in defending their mutual interest in liberty. Using the pseudonym “American Guesser,” Franklin wrote

‘Tis curious and amazing to observe how distinct and independent of each other the rattles of this animal are, and yet how firmly they are united together, so as to never be separated but by breaking them to pieces. – One of those rattles singly, is incapable of producing sound, but the ringing of thirteen together, sufficient to alarm the boldest man living. The Rattle-Snake is solitary, and associates with her kind only when it is necessary for their preservation – In winter, the warmth of a number together will preserve their lives, while singly, they would probably perish – The power of fascination attributed to her, by a generous construction, may be understood to mean, that those who consider the liberty and blessings which America affords, and once come over to her, never afterwards leave her, but spend their lives with her.<sup>6</sup>

The concept of shared sovereignty between the states and national government was older than the first military conflict with Britain. However, when Franklin wrote about the American rattlesnake, the political conflict concerning the division of authority between the national and state governments was not resolved in America. The federal<sup>7</sup> characteristic of the newly formed country caused unique internal factions. In fact, the problems that arose from the division of state and national powers caused America’s founders to replace the ineffective

---

<sup>5</sup> Benjamin Franklin. *Benjamin Franklin Writings*. (New York: The Library of America, 1987), 744.

<sup>6</sup> Franklin, 746.

<sup>7</sup> The term “federal” in this paper refers to the political ideology promoting shared sovereignty between local state governments and the collective national government, while the term “national” refers to a centralized institution of authority that represents the country as a whole.

Articles of Confederation with the Constitution. Following the drafting of the Constitution, the document was signed on September 17, 1787, by thirty-nine of the forty-one delegates who were still present in Philadelphia.<sup>8</sup> Despite the unified display of support by delegates, the Constitutional dispute regarding restraints on the national government's power was far from being settled. When the Constitution was sent to be ratified by the states, the nation's leaders split into two primary political groups. The groups were the Federalists, who supported ratification of the Constitution and a strong central government, and the Anti-Federalists, who opposed both ratification and a stronger central government. The outcome of this political conflict ultimately resulted in the successful ratification of the Constitution in June of 1788, but it also led to the first ten amendments to the Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights.<sup>9</sup>

The terms "Federalists" and "Anti-Federalists" designated the key political groups during the ratification process of the Constitution and through the passing of the Bill of Rights. The difference between the two political ideologies was somewhat confusing, for the intended definition of the opposition parties was incongruous with the etymology of the terms. George Bryan, an Anti-Federalist from Pennsylvania explained, "The name of Federalists, or Federal men, grew up at New York and the eastern states, some time before the calling of the Convention, to denominate such as were attached to the general support of the United States, in opposition to those who preferred local and particular advantage."<sup>10</sup> Because those who supported a more centralized government with ratification of the Constitution claimed the misnomer "Federalists," those who were in opposition to the Constitution due to their support of a confederated government authority accepted the misnomer "Anti-Federalists" by default.

Between the signing of the Constitution in September of 1787 and the ratification in June of 1788, the debate on the Constitution reached its zenith in the public arena. Article 7 of the Constitution stated that nine of the thirteen states' legislatures needed to approve the Constitution in order for it to be ratified.<sup>11</sup> Therefore, the Federalists and the Anti-Federalists embarked on separate public campaigns to support or discourage the Constitution. Within the two months after the Constitutional Convention, some of the most influential writings from the Constitution's opponents and supporters began to be published. These included the "Letters from the Federal Farmer to the Republican," which were possibly written by the Anti-Federalist Richard Henry Lee,<sup>12</sup> and The Federalist letters which were written by the Federalists Alexander

---

<sup>8</sup> Forrest McDonald. *Novus Ordo Seclorum: The Intellectual Origins of the Constitution*. (Lawrence, KS: The University Press of Kansas, 1985), 228.

<sup>9</sup> Bernard Bailyn. *The Debate on the Constitution*. (New York: The Library of America, 1993), 1097.

<sup>10</sup> McDonald, 284.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 279.

<sup>12</sup> Robert Allen Rutland, ed. *The Birth of the Bill of Rights: 1776-1791*. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1955), 126.

Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay, all of whom wrote under the title “Publius.”<sup>13</sup>

The Federalists claimed that the rights of Americans were tacit in the nature of the Constitution, while the Anti-Federalists were not convinced that any rights were guaranteed in the document unless specifically expressed. The new Constitution seemed to be destined to the same fate as that of the Articles of Confederation, unless this ambiguity could be clarified for the two rival political factions. In January 1788, Thomas B. Wait, founder of the first newspaper in the district of Maine, wrote a personal letter to George Thatcher, a supporter of Constitutional ratification, in which he explained the need for the clarification of liberties: “Bill of Rights have been the happy instruments of wresting the privileges and rights of the people from the hand of America to defend them against future encroachments of despotism – Bill of Rights, in my opinion, are the grand bulwarks of freedom.”<sup>14</sup> Wait’s quote summarized the Anti-Federalist’s position on the Constitution: a bill of rights was needed in order to safeguard the liberties of the people against an overzealous government.

Pressure to draft amendments to the Constitution was strong, but the Federalists’ desire to prevent the drafting of amendments was also a factor in the formation of the Bill of Rights. One of the most vehement opponents to a bill of rights, Alexander Hamilton contended that such an addition to the Constitution was “unnecessary” and “dangerous.” Hamilton explained his philosophy in “Federalist 84” in May of 1788: “They would contain various exceptions to powers which are not granted; and on this very account, would afford a colourable pretext to claim more than were granted. For why declare that things shall not be done which there is no power to do?”<sup>15</sup> As Hamilton stated, the Federalists were against a bill of rights because the rights of the national government were already limited by the Constitution. According to the Federalists, the U.S. Constitution did not expressly restrict the powers of the federal government. However, liberties of the people were implied because the powers of the national government were limited to the rights enumerated in the Constitution. All other rights automatically went to the people. Adding to the complexity of the argument over the extent of the national government’s powers was the ambiguous nature of two clauses in the Constitution. These clauses were the Necessary and Proper Clause located in article 1, section 8, and the Supremacy Clause located in article 6.

The Necessary and Proper Clause stated “To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”<sup>16</sup> This particular

---

<sup>13</sup> Bailyn, 1093-1094.

<sup>14</sup> Bailyn, 728.

<sup>15</sup> Alexander Hamilton, John Jay and James Madison. *The Federalist Papers*. Cynthia Brantley Johnson, eds. (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2004), 613.

<sup>16</sup> U.S. Const. art. 1, sec. 8.

clause followed the listing of all authorities granted to the U.S. Congress, and therefore caused controversy among many of the Founders as to what powers, if any, were restricted from Congressional use. While explaining his opposition to Constitutional ratification, the “Federal Farmer” wrote in reference to the Necessary and Proper Clause in October of 1787: “It is proper the national laws should be supreme, and superior to state or district laws; but then the national laws ought to yield to unalienable or fundamental rights – and national laws, made by a few men, should extend only to a few national objects.”<sup>17</sup> The “Federal Farmer’s” statement reflected many of the Anti-Federalist’s sentiments toward the Constitution. They were not opposed to strengthening the national government by granting it more authority, for most colonial leaders realized that the Articles of Confederation prevented America from making critical decisions that were needed for the growth and development of the country. However, the Anti-Federalists were concerned that the legislative power of the national government would go unchecked by the states, leaving open the possibility that fundamental liberties would be abused. Again, the Constitution’s opponents were reluctant to accept that the Constitution placed ample limits on the power of the national government. This issue of adequate limitations on the national government’s power was addressed by Brutus, an anonymous Anti-Federalist author, in his fifth letter in the New York Journal. Brutus referred to the Necessary and Proper Clause when he wrote in December of 1787 that “This amounts to a power to make laws at discretion: No terms can be found more indefinite than these, and it is obvious, that the legislature alone must judge what laws are proper and necessary for the purpose.”<sup>18</sup> The Federalists countered that the Constitution already provided for exactly the sort of limited government that their political opponents wanted.

Much of the writing coming from the Federalists was aimed at convincing the citizens of the states that the Anti-Federalists were exaggerating the possibility of despotism under the jurisdiction of the Constitution. Alexander Hamilton posited this logic when he wrote “to the People of the State of New York” in January of 1788. Hamilton explained to his New York readers in “Federalist 33” that the Necessary and Proper Clause and the Supremacy Clause posed no more threat to liberty than if the clauses were not even included in the Constitution: “They are only declaratory of a truth, which would have resulted by necessary and unavoidable implication from the very act of constituting a Federal government, and vesting it with certain specified powers.”<sup>19</sup> To Hamilton and his political partners, these clauses were simply truisms, so there was no need for increased clarification of liberties or restrictions on the government. The Federalists claimed that the Constitution was already specific enough in defining what powers were legally available to the national government. Moreover, the language of the Constitution, including the Necessary and Proper Clause,

---

<sup>17</sup> Bailyn, 276.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 500.

<sup>19</sup> Hamilton, 222.

was required in order to make sure that the national government had ample authority to exercise its given responsibilities. In a response to a speech critical of the Constitution by the Anti-Federalist delegate William Findley,<sup>20</sup> a leading Federalist delegate, James Wilson, explained why the Necessary and Proper Clause was indeed necessary.<sup>21</sup> Both men's speeches took place at the Pennsylvania ratifying convention, the first to convene in the country.<sup>22</sup> During Wilson's remarks which took place on December 1, 1787, he stated in reference to the Necessary and Proper Clause: "I hope that it is not meant to give to congress merely an illusive shew of authority, to deceive themselves or constituents any longer. On the contrary, I trust it is meant, that they shall have power of carrying into effect the laws, which they shall make under the powers vested in them by this constitution."<sup>23</sup> Despite Wilson's insistence that the national government needed at least some authority that overruled the authority of the separate states, the Anti-Federalists persisted in contesting the ratification of the Constitution. They still claimed that the Constitution endorsed absolute and uncontested power for the national government.

Besides the Necessary and Proper Clause, the Supremacy Clause, which was located in article 6 of the Constitution, further complicated the debate on exactly how and to what extent the powers of the national government were limited. The Supremacy Clause stated "This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding."<sup>24</sup> This clause raised specific concern over what restrictions of jurisdiction were placed on the national government. Just as the Anti-Federalists had attacked the Necessary and Proper Clause, they also wrote in opposition to the Supremacy clause. An article was published on December 18, 1787, in the *Pennsylvania Packet* by the group of delegates who dissented from the majority decision to ratify the Constitution at the Pennsylvania Convention.<sup>25</sup> In their letter of explanation to the public, the Pennsylvania minority wrote "It has been alleged that the words 'pursuant to the constitution,' are a restriction upon the authority of Congress; but when it is considered that by other sections they are invested with every efficient power of government, and which may be exercised to the absolute destruction of the state governments, without any violation of even the forms of the constitution, this seeming restriction, as well as every other restriction in it, appears to us be nugatory and delusive; and only introduced as a blind upon

---

<sup>20</sup> Bailyn, 1004.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., 1053.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., 1183.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., 826.

<sup>24</sup> U.S. Const. Art. 6

<sup>25</sup> Bailyn, 1050.

the real nature of the government.”<sup>26</sup> When considered in conjunction with the Necessary and Proper Clause, the Anti-Federalists contended that the Supremacy Clause gave absolute and unrestricted authority to the national government. As explained in the quotation from the Pennsylvania minority opinion, the Anti-Federalists also claimed that the language of the Constitution, especially in the Necessary and Proper Clause and the Supremacy Clause, was implemented by Federalists in order to grant the national government superior power over state governments while maintaining the appearance of protecting the states’ rights. The Federalists, however, rejected this concern and continued to insist that the sort of tyranny thought possible by their political opponents was no more likely to arise than if both clauses were removed from the Constitution. Noah Webster, who would later become famous for his dictionaries, responded to the Pennsylvania minority with an article of his own on December 31, 1787. Webster wrote in the New York newspaper, the *Daily Advertiser*: “You harp upon that clause of the New Constitution, which declares, that the laws of the United States, &c. shall be the supreme law of the land; when you know that the powers of the Congress are defined, to extend only to those matters which are in their nature and effects, general. You know, the Congress cannot meddle with the internal police of any State, or abridge its Sovereignty.”<sup>27</sup> Despite the disparity in the language that the Federalists and Anti-Federalists preferred for the Constitution, both groups claimed to be ardent defenders of the liberties that they had just fought against the British to win.

The main difference in opinion continued to be focused on whether or not liberties were preserved by the Constitution. The Federalists and Anti-Federalists even agreed, at least in public documents, that the national government and state governments should both be charged with the responsibility of preserving such liberties. However, the two groups still could not agree on what language would effectively ensure that these principles were defined and protected and that neither the national government nor the state governments held monopolies on power. The Federalists claimed that such protection was already clearly established in the Constitution, while the Anti-Federalists wanted more explicit assurance. Alexander Hamilton assured New York’s citizens that both the national and state governments would continue to hold separate sovereignty after the Constitution’s ratification. Hamilton commented on the subject of state rights in the “Federalist 32,” which was published in the *Independent Journal* on January 2, 1788: “The necessity of a concurrent jurisdiction in certain cases results from the division of the sovereign power; and the rule that all authorities of which the States are not explicitly divested in favour of the Union remain with them in full vigour, is not only a theoretical consequence of that division, but is clearly admitted by the whole tenor the instrument which contains the articles of the proposed constitution.”<sup>28</sup> The “Federal Farmer” had already warned American

---

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., 538.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., 560.

<sup>28</sup> Hamilton, 220.

citizens against such claims of dual sovereignty. As the “Federal Farmer” explained in his letter from October 12, 1787, “It is to be observed that when the people shall adopt the proposed constitution it will be their last and supreme act; it will be adopted not by the people of New-Hampshire, Massachusetts, &c. but by the people of the United States; and whenever this constitution, or any part of it, shall be incompatible with the ancient customs, rights, the laws or the constitutions heretofore established in the United States, it will entirely abolish them and do them away...”<sup>29</sup> Ultimately the Constitution was adopted as the official plan for the new U.S. Constitution when it was ratified by the New Hampshire state convention, which was the ninth state to approve the Constitution and the final vote needed for ratification.<sup>30</sup> However, the debate over the Constitution was not settled through ratification by the states. For the debate between Federalists and Anti-Federalists was not just about what wording in the document would properly defend individual liberties; it was concerned primarily with what system of government would allow such liberties to be realistically maintained.

Federalists and Anti-Federalists agreed that dual-sovereignty should be maintained under the form of government. As shown from the several quotes in the paragraphs above, the two groups disagreed over whether the Constitution actually provided for a system of dual sovereignty. But the language was only part of the issue. The two groups’ different political philosophies were instrumental in determining which individuals supported which particular issues. For the Anti-Federalists, the concept of federalism, or the division of authority between the national government and the state governments, was vital to defending the liberties of individuals. For the Federalists, the system of federalism was not necessarily required to preserve individual rights. James Winthrop, the Anti-Federalist author of several essays that appeared in the Boston newspaper, the *Massachusetts Gazette*, explained why federalism was so vital to American liberty. Winthrop’s fourth letter under the pseudonym “Agrippa” appeared on December 4, 1787. It stated

The idea of an uncompounded republick, on an average, one thousand miles in length, and eight hundred in breadth, and containing six millions of white inhabitants all reduced to the same standard of morals, or habits, and of laws, is in itself an absurdity, and contrary to the whole experience of mankind. The attempt by Great-Britain to introduce such a system, stuck us with horror, and when it was proposed by some theorists that we should be represented in parliament, we uniformly declared that one legislature could not represent so many different interests for the purposes of legislation and taxation.<sup>31</sup>

As “Agrippa” explained, the concept of federalism provided for the possibility

---

<sup>29</sup> Bailyn, 275.

<sup>30</sup> Rutland, 162.

<sup>31</sup> Bailyn, 450.

that different regions or states could hold many different standards for rights and laws without directly interfering with the rights and laws of another region or state. The ability of different states to determine separate standards for rights was only limited when such standards interfered with the responsibilities or rights of the national government as defined by the Articles of Confederation or the new United States Constitution. But what language in the new Constitution guaranteed that the states maintained all of the rights that were not specifically defined as belonging to the national government? As was explained earlier, the Anti-Federalists took issue with such clauses as the Necessary and Proper Clause and the Supremacy Clause, which, according to them, made it impossible to determine exactly which rights belonged to which level of government. According to the Federalists, further clarification between state rights and the power of the national government was not needed because such changes in wording were useless. Alexander Hamilton explained why the Federalists took such a position in "Federalist 33" from January 2, 1788: "If the Foederal Government should overpass the just bounds of its authority, and make a tyrannical use of its powers; the people whose creature it is must appeal to the standard they have formed, and take such measures to redress the injury done to the constitution, as the exigency may suggest and prudence justify."<sup>32</sup> Therefore, Hamilton wrote that under cases of tyranny by the national government, it was the responsibility of the citizens to protect their own inherent freedoms. Mere words would never guarantee protection from a government. Hamilton went on to inquire in the same paragraph: "Suppose by some forced constructions of its authority (which indeed cannot easily be imagined) the Foederal Legislature should attempt to vary the law of descent in any State; would it not be evident that in making such an attempt it had exceeded its jurisdiction and infringed upon that of the State?"<sup>33</sup>

This question was not rhetorical to Anti-Federalists. They insisted that, in order to ensure that state rights were not trampled upon, there must be more clearly defined limitations placed on the national government. However, after the Constitution was ratified, the Anti-Federalists could not repeal the unwanted sections of the Constitution or convince citizens to oppose the new document openly. Only one tactic was still available: to demand a Bill of Rights.

The First Federal Congress was the first official meeting of the House of Representatives and the Senate under the U.S. Constitution. Meeting in New York City in March of 1789 and reaching quorum on April 6, the newly elected government body was composed largely of Federalists.<sup>34</sup> Only ten of the fifty-nine members in the House of Representatives and two of the twenty-two members in the Senate were Anti-Federalists. While all of the Anti-Federalists in Congress supported adding a bill of rights to the Constitution, most of the Federalists

---

<sup>32</sup> Hamilton, 224.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., 224.

<sup>34</sup> Helen E. Veit, Kenneth R. Bowling and Charlene Bangs Bickford. *Creating the Bill of Rights: The Documentary Record from the First Federal Congress*. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991), xiv.



in Congress did not support adopting a bill of rights, at least not the list of amendments their political rivals proposed.<sup>35</sup> Despite the Federalists' dominance in numbers, two factors increased the likelihood that a bill of rights would be added to the Constitution. Three of the four remaining states would ratify the Constitution by the end of the summer of 1788,<sup>36</sup> but the New York, Virginia, and North Carolina ratifying conventions all made official commitments to a second national convention in order to adopt amendments.<sup>37</sup> The last of the thirteen original colonies to ratify the Constitution were not the only states to have supported a bill of rights as a method to ensure liberties. Only Rhode Island and Connecticut did not provide for certain rights in the state constitutions, and seven of the states, excluding New York, New Jersey, South Carolina, and Georgia, preserved these rights with some sort of bill of rights in the state constitution.<sup>38</sup> In addition to the fact that most states had first hand experience with some form of a bill of rights, some Federalists such as James Madison were elected to Congress because of the campaign pledge to their constituents that once in office they would support amending the Constitution in order to prevent the national government from abusing certain rights of the people.<sup>39</sup>

Political labels were not always sufficient to distinguish between supporters and opponents of amending the Constitution. Some Anti-Federalists and many Federalists opposed adding a bill of rights to the Constitution based on the principle that rights of the people should not be confined to a list. Such opponents contended that if amendments were made to the Constitution, the rights of the people could be interpreted as being limited to the few enumerated in the amendments, rather than being unrestricted by governments. Patrick Henry inquired as a member of the Virginia ratifying convention,<sup>40</sup> "Do not you Gentlemen see, that if we adopt under the idea of following Mr. Jefferson's opinion, we amuse ourselves with the shadow, while the substance is given away?" In this remark from June 12, 1788,<sup>41</sup> Henry attacked Thomas Jefferson's position that support for the Constitution should be contingent upon the addition of a bill of rights. Jefferson wrote in a letter to James Madison on December 20, 1787: "Let me add that a bill of rights is what the people are entitled to against every government on earth, general or particular, & what no just government should refuse, or rest on inference."<sup>42</sup> While Jefferson was not a member in the First Federal Congress, in addition to Anti-Federalists, some Federalists in Congress also supported a list of amendments pertaining to individual rights.

---

<sup>35</sup> Veit, xii.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, x-xi. In May of 1790, Rhode Island became the last state of the original thirteen colonies to ratify the Constitution. - Rutland, 217.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, xi.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 87.

<sup>39</sup> Rutland, 198.

<sup>40</sup> Bailyn, 1011.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 674.

<sup>42</sup> Rutland, 129.

On October 17, 1787, Madison wrote in a letter to his friend Thomas Jefferson: “My own opinion has always been in favor of a bill of rights,” and added, “provided it be so framed as not to imply powers not meant to be included in the enumeration.”<sup>43</sup> Although James Madison would be known to later Americans as the Father of the Constitution, it was he who first proposed that amendments to protect individual liberties be added to the Constitution.<sup>44</sup> Madison may have supported a bill of rights, but not all of his Federalist partners agreed with him. Even the location of the amendments in the Constitution could not be agreed upon, not to mention the disagreement over the content of the amendments.

The criticism that James Madison received for his proposed version of a bill of rights was one example of the complex nature of the debate surrounding additional amendments. Both Federalists and Anti-Federalists referred to Madison’s proposed bill of rights as a “tube to the whale.” This phrase was, as Veit explained, “a literary allusion to Jonathan Swift’s *Tale of a Tube* (1704),” in which “Swift described how sailors, encountering a whale that threatened to damage their ship, flung it ‘an empty tube by way of amusement’ to divert it.”<sup>45</sup> Madison’s political rivals and partners used the allusion to Swift’s story to point out that his version of a bill of rights was simply a diversion for those members concerned with state rights. The Federalists who supported a bill of rights wanted to make sure that any added amendment would not change the structure of the national government by giving the states additional powers or by hindering any of those powers already afforded to the national government in the Constitution. The goal of the Anti-Federalists was the opposite; they wanted to expand the authority of state governments, while limiting the powers of the national government.

One of the most prominent Anti-Federalist proponents of a bill of rights was Senator Richard Henry Lee from Virginia. Lee summarized the general philosophy of the Anti-Federalist congressmen in the First Federal Congress when in a letter to Patrick Henry from September 14, 1789, he wrote

The most essential danger from the present System arises, [in my] opinion, from its tendency to a consolidated government, instead of a Union of Confederated States – The history of the world and reason concurs in proving that so extensive a Territory [as the] U. States comprehend never was, or can be governed in freed[om] under the former idea – Under latter it is abundantly m[ore] practicable, because extended representation, know[ledge of] character, and confidence in consequence, [are wanting] to sway the opinion of Rulers, without which, fear the offspr[ing] of Tyranny] can alone answer.<sup>46</sup>

Once again, Anti-Federalists like Lee were linking the practice of federalism with the preservation of liberty. The Anti-Federalists viewed the Bill of Rights as an

---

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., 192.

<sup>44</sup> Veit, xiv.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid., xv.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., 295.

opportunity to ensure certain state powers would not be infringed upon by the national government, thereby preserving a broad spectrum of personal liberties consistent with the wide array of opinions represented in the American populace.

Some Federalists, however, expressed their concern in Congress that a bill of rights would actually put many of their constituents' liberties in jeopardy. Originally from Britain, Georgia Congressman James Jackson was one such Federalist who espoused such a view in the national legislature.<sup>47</sup> According to the *Gazette of the United States* printed on June 10, 1789, Jackson warned his fellow members of Congress that "There is a maxim in law, and it will apply to bills of rights, that when you enumerate exceptions, that the exceptions operate to the exclusion of all circumstances that are omitted; consequently, unless you except every right from the grant of power, those omitted are inferred to be resigned to the discretion of the government."<sup>48</sup> In other words, Jackson argued as Patrick Henry had done, that enumerating certain rights would annihilate all other rights not listed in the Constitution. Although Jackson and likeminded Federalists ultimately disagreed with Richard Henry Lee and the other Anti-Federalists in Congress on the issue of adding additional amendments to the Constitution, the same Federalists agreed with Anti-Federalists that a bill of rights providing solely for individual liberties could potentially be abused by the national government. Lee explained in the letter to Henry cited above that "Some valuable Rights are indeed *declared*, but the powers that remain are very sufficient to render them nugatory at pleasure."<sup>49</sup> According to Lee, the rights proposed by Federalists like Madison were well worth protecting, but as long as the national government maintained supreme jurisdiction those rights were worthless. While the rights would have been legally valid, there would have been no way to enforce the protection of the liberties in the absence of increased state powers.

Ultimately, a bill of rights was passed by the First Federal Congress, but the content left the Anti-Federalists disappointed as it did not change the structure of the national government. Richard Henry Lee expressed the mood of the Anti-Federalists to Patrick Henry in the letter from September 14, 1789, when he wrote "We might as well have attempted to move Mount Atlas upon our shoulders – In fact, the idea of subsequent Amendments was delusion altogether, and so intended by the greater part of those who arrogated to themselves the name of Federalists."<sup>50</sup> As Lee explained in this letter, the Anti-Federalists knew that they were facing almost certain defeat in their attempt to restructure the power structure of the national government through amendments. They had already failed to secure restrictions on the national government to their satisfaction at the Constitutional Convention; therefore, they were not surprised that they failed to restructure the government through the amendment process.

---

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, 306.

<sup>48</sup> Veit, 87.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, 295.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, 295.

The proposed Bill of Rights was passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate by September 25, 1789, and, following the signature of President Washington, was sent to be ratified by the states.<sup>51</sup> Most of the twelve proposed amendments dealt with individual rights. Besides two proposed amendments that dealt with the election and payment process of the Federal Congress and one that dealt with the powers of the states, all other amendments referred to the personal rights of Americans.<sup>52</sup> Madison did attempt to quell the fears of the Anti-Federalists and the general public when he wrote about the limited powers of the federal government in “Federalist 45.” In this article that was printed on January 26, 1788, Madison wrote

The powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the Federal Government, are few and defined. Those which are to remain in the State Governments are numerous and indefinite. The former will be exercised principally on external objects, as war, peace, negotiation, and foreign commerce; with which last the power of taxation will for the most part be connected. The powers reserved to the several States will extend to all the objects, which, in the ordinary course of affairs, concern the lives, liberties and properties of the people; and the internal order, improvement, and prosperity of the State.<sup>53</sup>

As the Anti-Federalists were still not satisfied with the demarcations between national and state powers after the ratification of the Constitution, the Federalists were forced to provide greater assurances to their state rights rivals in the form of a bill of rights. Despite the overwhelming dominance in the numbers of Federalists over the Anti-Federalists at the First Federal Congress, the Federalists were compelled to make at least some show of a concession in the form of a states’ rights amendment. The Federalists recognized their need for Anti-Federalist support if the new plan for government was going to hold any lasting authority. John Page, a Federalist representative from Virginia, explained to his fellow congressional members in New York that “Unless you take early notice of this subject, you will not have power to deliberate. The people will clamor for a new Convention; they will not trust the House any longer.”<sup>54</sup> Page was referring to adding amendments to the Constitution, but as had already been observed in previous debates, the Anti-Federalists would not be satisfied with what they considered to be “a tube to the whale.”

The sole provision for state rights in Madison’s list of nine amendments was found in the last proposition, which stated “The powers not delegated by this constitution nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states

---

<sup>51</sup> Rutland, 215.

<sup>52</sup> Veit, 3-4.

<sup>53</sup> Madison, 333.

<sup>54</sup> Eugene W. Hickok, Jr., ed. *The Bill of Rights: Original Meaning and Current Understanding*. (Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1991), 460.

respectively.”<sup>55</sup> By presenting the resolution for the rights amendments on June 8, 1789, Madison fulfilled his campaign promise to consider the issue of Constitutional amendments.<sup>56</sup> However, the resolution offered by Madison met resistance from Anti-Federalists who attempted to add more definitive language to his last amendment. For instance, South Carolinian Congressman Thomas Tudor Tucker proposed that Madison’s ninth amendment be modified to state “the powers not expressly delegated by this Constitution.”<sup>57</sup> The addition of the word “expressly” was essential to the Anti-Federalist goal of limiting the national government to specific powers, for without such a declaration of defined powers, the national government would be free to utilize whatever authority it deemed to be “necessary and proper.” On August 18, 1789, the same day that Tucker offered his amendment to Madison’s ninth proposition, *The Congressional Register* reported that Mr. Madison “Objected to this amendment, because it was impossible to confine a government to the exercise of express powers by implication, unless the constitution descended to recount every minutiae.”<sup>58</sup> This argument echoed the same points of debate that had surrounded the constitutional ratification process. Anti-Federalists contended that unless the boundaries of the national government’s authority were expressly defined, the rights of states and therefore individual citizens were in jeopardy. Federalists, on the other hand, contended that expressly defining the powers of the national government, would cripple its ability to fulfill its responsibilities.

After Tucker’s revision failed to pass out of committee, another Anti-Federalist, Elbridge Gerry, also attempted to add the word “expressly” to the Madison amendment. The outcome was the same, with a vote of thirty-two to seventeen in opposition to the changed wording. In September of 1789, Congress sent a final list of twelve amendments to be ratified by the states, leaving Madison’s proposition dealing with the powers of the states basically intact after a few additional changes.<sup>59</sup> The state rights proposition was designated as the twelfth amendment in the congressional list to the states and read “The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the United States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.”<sup>60</sup> Although the two amendments that dealt with the election and payment process of members of Congress were not ratified by the states, all other amendments were ratified on December 15, 1791, when Virginia became the last necessary state to sign.<sup>61</sup> Therefore, the twelfth proposed amendment by Congress became the Tenth Amendment in the Bill of Rights.

---

<sup>55</sup> Veit, 14.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid., xii.

<sup>57</sup> Hickok, 462.

<sup>58</sup> Veit, 197.

<sup>59</sup> Hickok, 462.

<sup>60</sup> Veit, 4.

<sup>61</sup> Rutland, 217

While the Tenth Amendment did not specifically define which powers were denied to the national government, all founders were in agreement that the powers were limited. During the meeting of the First Federal Congress, the “Gazette of the United States” reported on June 10, 1789, that James Madison said, “Fears respecting the judiciary system, should be entirely done away – and an express declaration made, that all rights not expressly given up, are retained.”<sup>62</sup> Of course, the final ratified version of the Bill of Rights did not have this express guarantee. Even the staunchest proponents of a strong national government acknowledged that the Constitution provided for a system of shared authority between the state and national governments. For example, Alexander Hamilton wrote that “The powers of sovereignty are in this country divided between the National and State Governments,” and “each of the *portions* of powers delegated to the one or the other ... is ... sovereign *with regard to its proper objects*.”<sup>63</sup> As Hamilton explained, the national government maintained sovereignty within its realm of designated powers, and the state governments maintained sovereignty within their realm of designated powers. Although the Constitution provided a line of authority between the national government and the state governments, the responsibility for determining the precise limits of authority rested in the hands of the people.

The Constitution was ratified, not by the states and not by the people of the American nation, but by the people of each individual state. As historian Forrest McDonald explained in his book *Novus Ordo Seclorum: The Intellectual Origins of the Constitution*, “This unmistakably implied that the residue of sovereignty that was committed neither to the national/federal nor to the state governments remained in them – an implication that was subsequently made explicit by the Tenth Amendment.”<sup>64</sup> Regardless of who held ultimate sovereignty, the national government had gained a considerable amount of power through the ratification of the Constitution. The juxtaposed responses from the Anti-Federalists and Federalists after the Constitution’s ratification were representative of the potential positive and negative effects from the new system of government. Robert Whitehall, a Pennsylvania Anti-Federalist, stated on November 30, 1787, as a member of his state’s ratifying convention: “I have said, with encreasing confidence I repeat, that the proposed constitution must eventually annihilate the independent sovereignty of the several states.”<sup>65</sup> The pessimism of the Anti-Federalists was met with great hope by their political opponents. The optimism of the Federalists could be heard in the farewell address of George Washington published on September 19, 1796.<sup>66</sup> Here, Washington emphasized the strength of his young country through its unification when he said, “The unity of government, which constitutes you one people is also now dear to you.

---

<sup>62</sup> Veit, 67.

<sup>63</sup> McDonald, 278.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, 280.

<sup>65</sup> Bailyn, 811.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, 1109.

It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety, of your prosperity, of that very liberty which you so highly prize.”<sup>67</sup> Both Anti-Federalists and Federalists thought their particular brands of government protected liberty best. By debating whether a strong centralized government balanced with weaker state governments or a weaker centralized government balanced with strong state governments would be more conducive to preserving the people’s rights, they managed to form a government of dual sovereignty that has been in place for over two hundred years. Alexander Hamilton explained the founders’ challenge in creating a working government that would preserve liberty when he wrote on July 12, 1781: “History is full of examples, where in contests for liberty, a jealousy of power has either defeated the attempts to recover or preserve it in the first instance, or has afterwards subverted it by clogging government with too great precautions for its security, or by leaving too wide a door for sedition and popular licentiousness.”<sup>68</sup> It has remained a difficult task to balance the proper amount of power needed by a government to fulfill its responsibilities and the proper safeguards on that government needed to protect the inalienable rights of its citizens. However, the foundation of Federalism provided in the Constitution has allowed the American people to enjoy the liberty to determine that proper balance in their government.

---

<sup>67</sup> Rhodi Jeffreys-Jones, and Bruce Collins, eds. *The Growth of Federal Power in American History*. (Dekalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 1983), 11.

<sup>68</sup> McDonald, 2.

## Bibliography

Bailyn, Bernard. *The Debate on the Constitution*. New York: The Library of America, 1993.

Franklin, Benjamin. *Benjamin Franklin Writings*. New York: The Library of America, 1987.

Hamilton, Alexander, John Jay and James Madison. *The Federalist Papers*. Enriched Classics, edited by Cynthia Brantley Johnson. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2004.

Hickok, Eugene W., Jr., ed. *The Bill of Rights: Original Meaning and Current Understanding*. Charlottesville and London: The University Press of Virginia, 1991.

Jeffreys-Jones, Rhodri. and Bruce Collins, eds. *The Growth of Federal Power in American History*. DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 1983.

McDonald, Forrest. *Novus Ordo Seclorum: The Intellectual Origins of the Constitution*. Lawrence, KS: The University Press of Kansas, 1985.

Rutland, Robert Allen, ed. *The Birth of the Bill of Rights: 1776-1791*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1955.

Veit, Helen E., Kenneth R. Bowling and Charlene Bangs Bickford. *Creating the Bill of Rights: The Documentary Record from the First Federal Congress*. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1991.

*Image at right: Senator William Ezra Jenner, photographer and date unknown. Courtesy of the Archives at Hanover College.*





## Senator William Ezra Jenner

### Foreword

*By William Edward Jenner, Esq.*

Why do I feel compelled to write about my father? Perhaps because as I grow older, I feel my own mortality and want to express these thoughts so that my own sons will have them. My father was, if nothing else, a loving father who always placed my welfare first and did everything to help me achieve my goals. I could always rely on his promises and knew that if he said that he would help me, he would do everything in his power to do so. I never had to doubt his motives, intentions, or love. If I have had any success as a father to four sons, it is because I tried to follow his example in my relationships with them.

A friend, who had grown up with a very dysfunctional father, once told me that when he had children he resolved most of all to be a good father. He, however, failed in that because he later realized he really didn't know how, because he had no role model. I feel blessed that I did.

My father was a generous and humorous man. He was friendly and loyal to his friends as they were, for the most part, to him. In politics, they were known as the "Jenner Gang." They stayed together even though they didn't control a great deal of patronage because of Dad's charisma and the fact that they could always count on his word. He always told me that in politics, more than any profession, "...your word is your bond." If you lie in a contract or business deal, you can be sued. There is no legal action for breach of promise in politics.

He not only made good friends in politics, he had many good social friends, business associates, and loyal secretaries. I think because he was fun to be around, essentially warm and kind, profane but never in a sexual or irreligious sense, people gravitated to him. Even many of the United States Senators who disagreed with him politically, and on policy and legislation, liked him as a person.

In his fifty-year marriage to my mother, he was also kind, loving and generous. The marriage worked, however, because of the kind of person she was. She did not interfere in, nor was she particularly interested in, his politics. When he got home from work, she would listen as he got things off his chest. Home was a place of refuge where little was demanded of him. She took care of me, their only child, kept a neat house, and had the meals prepared. She never sought the limelight even though she was attractive and had theatrical talent, which she left dormant throughout their marriage until his retirement from politics and return to her hometown of Bedford in 1958.

He was, in my view, more of a populist in internal affairs. His background was that of the common man. He was fair to labor and pro civil-rights. I do not remember him ever saying a derogatory thing about the African-American race or any other minority. His invective was saved for communists, fellow travelers, big spenders, and one worlders.

On news of his death, a college classmate and old friend of mine sent the clipping of the New York Times obituary and wrote that, “[he] was such a vital, interesting, and kind man. I have always felt it a distinct privilege to have known him and spent time with him. Mr. Jenner was also one of the best fathers and husbands I have known...his distinguished and outstanding public career only served to add an extra dimension to his personal stature.” I believe all my friends felt this way about my dad – and so did I.

## **A Brief Biography of William Ezra Jenner**

*By Jaleh Fazelian and Douglas Denné*

William E. Jenner was born in Marengo, Indiana, to L. Lenwood (Woody) and Jane Jenner on July 21, 1908. Jenner attended Indiana University and graduated with his Bachelor of Arts in 1930. Soon after, he began to study law and graduated with his law degree from Indiana University in 1932.

William Jenner married Janet Cuthill on June 30, 1933, and they had one son, William Jenner. In 1933, he also began his law practice in Paoli and Shoals, Indiana. In 1934, he ran for a seat in the State Senate and won. In 1937 and 1939, he was minority leader in the State Senate. In 1941, he became the President Pro Tempore.

Jenner resigned from the State Senate in June 1942 to join in the World War II effort. He served in the Army Air Corps in Europe. He was discharged as a Captain in October 1944.

Soon after his return from the World War II, Jenner was elected to fill the seat of deceased Senator Frederick Van Nuys. In 1946, he ran again and was elected to the U.S. Senate, beating former Indiana Governor M. Clifford Townsend.

Jenner served as a United States Senator from January 3, 1947 to January 3, 1959. During his service in the Senate, Jenner was deemed a conservative and held many isolationist views in the area of foreign affairs. He voted against the Taft-Hartley Bill and the Marshall Plan. He also voted against the North Atlantic Security Pact.

Jenner opposed President Truman in many respects and called for the impeachment of Truman after the firing of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

When President Dwight D. Eisenhower was elected, Jenner gained prominence as the chair of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary. During the mid 1950s, Jenner spent the vast majority of his time investigating Communist infiltration of the teaching profession.

Jenner was also a friend of Senator Joseph McCarthy. When McCarthy was censured by the Senate, Jenner voted against the censure and gave speeches condemning those who agreed to censure McCarthy. Jenner also gave a eulogy at McCarthy's funeral.

Jenner was a strong supporter of the civil rights movement from African-Americans. Jenner attempted to amend the Railway Labor Act of 1950, an act that allowed for racial and religious discrimination by unions. Additionally, Jenner laid out a plan for the Republican Party of 1945 calling for the inclusion of all races. His fight for civil rights endured until the end of his Senatorial career.

After retiring from the Senate, Jenner returned to Bedford, Indiana, to practice law. Jenner passed away on March 9, 1985.

Information taken from the following sources:

<http://bioguide.congress.gov/scripts/biodisplay.pl?index=J000093>

Jenner, William Ezra from Gale Biography Resource Center.

## **“Let’s Put America First”**

William Ezra Jenner, a Republican Senator from Indiana, gave the following speech as he addressed the Dallas Public Affairs Club and the Committee of One Hundred at the Bakers Hotel in Dallas, Texas, on February 14, 1955. His speech came seventeen days after Congress adopted the Formosa Resolution, which secured an American commitment for the defense of Formosa, present day Taiwan. In this speech Senator Jenner praised this resolution, yet spent a significant portion of it warning his listeners of the influence of Communist sympathizers in the U.S. government. Senator Jenner pointed to the fact that, “the problem lay in the divided authority in the formation of our [America’s] foreign policy between the constitutional and the pro-Communist.”<sup>69</sup> Throughout this speech William Jenner warned his audience of the need to “prevent the sellout of Formosa.”<sup>70</sup>

Address By The Honorable William E. Jenner (R-Ind)

BAKERS HOTEL, DALLAS, TEXAS – 12:00 Noon, February 14, 1955.

Sponsored by the Dallas Public Affairs Club and The Committee of One Hundred

### LET’S PUT AMERICA FIRST

It is always a pleasure for me to leave Washington and travel to one of our great states, to meet with the people there and to discuss our national problems. I believe fervently the strength of our nation resides not in the capital but in the vast expanse of our country. Empires are represented by, as they are governed by, their capital cities. Free countries are not divided into a capital city and the provinces, which are ruled by it.

It is a special pleasure for me to come to Texas because in my State of Indiana we still believe the United States is a union of sovereigns, and our state is in every respect the sovereign equal of the Federal Government. There is no deference in Indiana to the glamour and show, which are now so evident in Washington. We believe that we, the people, govern the country, and Washington is the front office, part of the administrative headquarters. I am sure that doctrine will sound right and proper in the State of Texas.

It is a favorite argument of the collectivists that foreign policy is something remote and abstract, which can be understood only by experts who have spent years in the precincts of the State Department or on the staffs of certainly [sic] daily papers. Congressmen, who have not had the benefit of long indoctrination in the mysteries, and you, who do not even breathe the air of Washington, are

---

<sup>69</sup> Michael Paul Poder, *The Senatorial Career of William E. Jenner: A Dissertation* (Michigan: UMI, Dissertation Services, 1976), 302.

<sup>70</sup> Poder, 304.

supposed to sit patiently and wait until the great minds have handed down what you may know.

Americans never accepted such nonsense. Our greatest diplomatic achievements were the work of laymen, who had spent most of their years in private life. In the last few years we have been bewildered and bemused by foreign relations experts in Washington offices, but the moment has come when the American people need to decide what kind of foreign policy they wish to stand for, and then tell our government to follow it.

#### PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S COMMITMENT TO THE FREE NATIONS

President Eisenhower's message on defense of the Nationalist stronghold on Formosa<sup>71</sup> will certainly be a landmark in American foreign affairs, but what kind of a landmark it will be is not yet certain.

First let us look at the documents themselves – the message of the President, and the resolution of Congress supporting the President's position.

In the words of the message and the resolution, the United States reaffirms its close ties with its loyal ally, the Nationalist government of China, and makes a commitment to defend the Nationalist stronghold with American military power if the Communists carry out their threat to attack it.

This statement does not solve all the problems of our foreign policy in the Western Pacific. There is no good reason why it should. We have had twenty years of mismanagement of our activities in Asia. It is not reasonable to ask that any single statement clear away all the confusion.

The message is significant because it deals with the most important question. We have announced that we shall tolerate no new retreat in Asia. The Red Chinese<sup>72</sup> will not be permitted to breach the frontiers of the still free world. We make it clear that we shall meet Communist military action with military action, the only argument the Communists understand. We will not start the shooting, but if the Communists choose to start a war, we will finish it.

A foreign policy carefully worked out in many conferences, publicly stated on the authority of the Chief Executive, and supported by Congress and both parties, should be firm as a rock.

But I say to you – what you know well – that the foreign policy established in the Formosa papers is not firm at all. The fact that it is clearly stated in a Presidential message, and formally approved by the legislative branch, may mean nothing. It is wholly possible that we shall follow the opposite policy of appeasement of the Communists, surrender of our advantage, and a sell-out of our loyal allies in Asia.

Why am I so certain that the wishes of the American President, the American Congress, and the American people, may be flouted?

---

<sup>71</sup> Current day Taiwan in East Asia off the coast of mainland China.

<sup>72</sup> Communist China, the People's Republic of China (PRC).

## TWO AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY CENTERS

The reason is – briefly – that we have two lines of authority in foreign policy-making. One is the line of responsibility laid down in our Constitution and followed by all those who believe in our Constitution. The other is a network whose members deliberately disregard our Constitution, our President and our Congress, and act as a law unto themselves.

The sad fact is that no public document, no formal commitment, no legal mandate, can determine American foreign policy today. Our fluctuating foreign policy is a tug-of-war between these two forces. It is an unsettled question which group will be triumphant in the struggle to shape our nation's destiny.

We have seen again and again in the last two decades, that the foreign policy put forward in our public statements, is not the foreign policy carried out by our government.

This is not because the American government has suddenly become untrustworthy. That would be a most inaccurate statement of what has happened.

The reason is that the American is a two-headed monster. It is led by two different organizing centers. The never-settled question of which center is to determine our foreign policies has kept us in constant turmoil, and made us look futile and ineffectual before the world.

This conflict between two heads of our government will not end until one or the other is wholly defeated, uprooted and destroyed.

For years now our government has been pulled in two opposite directions in making its decisions.

## ONE CENTER IS PRO-SOVIET

The hearings of the so-called Tydings Committee<sup>73</sup> disclosed clear evidence, in spite of the whitewash, that a powerful and ruthless group were [sic] guiding our decisions to the advantage of the Soviet Union. This was not news. Committees of Congress had been making the same charge for years.

The Russell Committee, which investigated the dismissal of General MacArthur,<sup>74</sup> and investigations by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee,<sup>75</sup> showed that a secret faction in our government had worked out its own foreign policy, to suit its own ends, and had by infinite skill, patience and ruthlessness, put it into effect, regardless of the legally established foreign policy set by

---

<sup>73</sup> The investigations of loyalty within the State Department were put under review by this subcommittee. The subcommittee was authorized in 1950 to look into the charges made by Senator Joe McCarthy regarding a list of individuals in the State Department that he claimed to be known members of the Communist Party of the United States.

<sup>74</sup> President Truman dismissed General Douglas MacArthur from command in 1951 for publicly disagreeing with his Korean War Policy.

<sup>75</sup> The subcommittee to investigate the administration of the Internal Security Act of 1950 as well as the enforcement of laws related to espionage, sabotage, and subversive activities in the United States.



Congress and by our President.

Throughout all of 1951 and 1952 the Congress, especially the Senate, was engaged in a Great Debate<sup>76</sup> to turn the light on this secret foreign policy and destroy its influence.

You know the achievements of this secret group.

After the defeat of Japan in World War II, our official foreign policy was to defend and strengthen the Nationalist government of China. But the secret faction in our government was determined we should support the Chinese Reds. In the name of the United States government, they insisted on a “united front” government in China, with the Communist rebels retaining their own armed forces. Our representative gave the Reds a long cease-fire by which they could rest and re-equip their armies, and he set up an embargo on American bullets for the guns of the defenders.

Since 1950, we have had two policies for the Nationalist government on Formosa. Our official policy was to support the legal government and help rearm the Nationalist forces. Congress voted the money again and again as proper for our own defense. But the hidden faction in our government intended that we should “disengage ourselves” – as the polite phrase goes – from the Nationalists. Their real policy for Formosa parallel the famous advice of Owen Lattimore,<sup>77</sup> to let Korea fall but not let it look as if we pushed her. In December, 1949 – five years ago – our State Department even issued instructions to its personnel abroad to show no regrets when the government on Formosa fell – according to plan.

During the war in Korea, we were ostensibly fighting to defeat the Red Chinese attackers. Our military leaders, our people, and I believe most of the members of the administration, were loyal to that objective. But the invisible group had a different policy. They were determined to prevent military victory over the Reds. They intended to return by force the Chinese prisoners of war who did not wish to go back to Communist China, as they returned the hopeless refugees in Europe after 1945. They intended to leave North Korea a wasteland, occupied by Red troops who could infiltrate South Korea at will and descend at a moment’s notice on Free Korea, with armies rested and reequipped.

The secret group won every objective except the return of the pitiful prisoners-of-war, who were saved by the insistence of Congress and the unrelenting determination of our military leaders.

The same double purpose can be found in our German policy, in Austria, in Italy, in Greece, and in the tragic surrender of all Eastern Europe to the Soviet Union.

The public policy of the United States, which has in almost all instances denounced conquest and supported the independent peaceful nations, has faded

---

<sup>76</sup> The Great Debate referred to the various subcommittees in the early 1950s that brought increasing focus on the foreign policy in Asia.

<sup>77</sup> Owen Lattimore, an author, scholar of Central Asia, and professor at Johns Hopkins University; he was accused of being a Soviet espionage agent by Senator Joseph McCarthy in 1950.



away. The secret policy of the faction so friendly to the Soviet Union has in almost every instance been triumphant.

Our public policy of resisting Communism has succeeded only in Turkey, and to a limited extent in Greece. But Secretary of Defense Forrestal,<sup>78</sup> who was determined to block the Communist advance, and who won over President Truman, was driven to an early grave. His hard policy of armed resistance to Communism was replaced by the soft policy of economic aid to Europe.

From 1945 to 1952 the power of the Soviet Union spread east and west, until it covered one-third of the world and put millions of people in bondage. The conflict between freedom and slavery was not lost in Asia or in Europe. It was lost in Washington, because the little group in our policy-making, which favored the Soviet Union, was stronger than the people who believed in a pro-American policy.

### IT'S [sic] PROGRAM IS DEFEAT OF THE FORMOSA POLICY

I say to you that the Eisenhower policy, for defense of the perimeter of the free world where it is threatened in the Formosa Strait,<sup>79</sup> will be undermined, eroded, covered up, twisted and made over into a policy favoring Red China, unless we learn our lesson, and deal with the realities of politics today.

Already erosion is apparent. We constantly hear it dinned in our ears that it is all right for us to defend Formosa, but very wrong to defend Quemoy and Matsu.<sup>80</sup> That is as if the UN should say to the United States, "You will reduce tension with the Soviet Union if you give up Alaska, which is nearer the Soviet border than it is to the United States. The Soviet Union says Alaska belongs to it. It does not matter if you need Alaska for radar information, weather information, and early warning of threatened attack. You must give up Alaska to the Soviet rulers so their tension will be lowered."

Another form of erosion is hidden in the warnings that Formosa really belongs to Japan, and so it is all right for the United States to intervene, but Quemoy and the Tachens<sup>81</sup> belong to China, and therefore, if we defend the coastal islands, we are threatening Red China. That argument omits the minor fact that we are not threatening the Reds. They are threatening us. They cannot get the coastal islands except by conquest. They have already tried and failed. It is they who talk of new conquests, not we.

A third form of erosion is the attempt to get a cease-fire in the United

---

<sup>78</sup> James Vincent Forrestal, Secretary of Defense in the Truman Administration from 1947 to 1949.

<sup>79</sup> Also called the Taiwan Strait, it was 180 kilometers wide and is located between mainland China and the island of Taiwan (Formosa).

<sup>80</sup> Islands located in the Formosa Strait. The islands were held by Nationalist Chinese forces after they were forced to flee to Formosa in 1949.

<sup>81</sup> The Tachen Islands were an archipelago consisting of 29 islands and covering 14.6 square kilometers. The islands are located in the Gulf of Taizhou, Zhejiang, off of the mainland of China.

Nations. A cease-fire would tell the Nationalists they could never win back their own country. That would be like telling George Washington he could have a cease-fire if he would remain in Valley Forge, but make no effort to reconquer New York or Philadelphia or Yorktown.

A cease-fire would free the Red armies for a new attack on Indo-China.

A cease-fire would give further recognition to the Red Chinese. It would tell the desperate people on the Mainland they had no hope. It would tell the people of Poland, the Balkans and East Germany, that the United States had no interest in their fate.

Other pitfalls are the proposals to establish two Chinas, and sooner or later to put Free China under a UN trusteeship.<sup>82</sup> We know where that will lead. After Red China is safely installed in UN as a “peace-loving” nation, it will bring up the demand that Formosa be surrendered to it, and cite the Cairo Declaration as proof we have already agreed to the proposal.

Perhaps the most serious threat of all is the recent report that our government intends to ask other members of the UN to help us patrol the Formosa Strait. That would end all pretense of either a pro-American or an anti-Communist policy. It would mean another “victory” like Korea.

#### THE UNITED NATIONS MAKES NO COMMITMENTS TO FREEDOM

Whatever you make of UN in general, it should be possible to get agreement among all good Americans on a few facts. The Soviet Union is a member of the United Nations. So are her satellites. She has a permanent seat on the Security Council, with the veto power.

The UN has no commitments to support freedom. For every obligation to the free nations it has corresponding obligations to the Communist nations. Its staff includes a proportion of open Communists, but it also has a substantial number of secret Communists. The UN recently awarded large damages to some American Fifth Amendment Communists on its staff, who were dismissed only because of hearings held by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

The UN is in the middle, see-sawing between the free world and the Communist world.

The most favorable policy to us, which the UN can adopt, is neutralism. It is nearer to downright co-existence.

This is the minimum of undisputed fact about UN on which all Americans can agree. The UN is an agent of both Communist, anti-Communist and neutral nations. It has no justification for favoring the side of the free. It has never pretended to do so. Nowhere in the vast outpouring of documents that flows from the UN is there any commitment to freedom. The UN works for “peace,” for welfare, for One World. It does not pretend to work for liberty.

---

<sup>82</sup> UN Trusteeships were put in place to help ensure that occupied territories or dependent countries were administered in the best interest of the inhabitants and of international peace and security.

## PRO-COMMUNISTS CANNOT BE STOPPED BY PAPERS

Why do I say that these proposals to soften up the Formosa resolution<sup>83</sup> – so dangerous to the interests of the United States, so shameful a breach of our moral obligations, – will probably prevail, in spite of the solemn commitment by the President and the Congress to a true American line of action?

The reason is this. A group of gangsters cannot be stopped by a written contract. A power group in government cannot be stopped by a state paper. A revolutionary junta, whose purpose is to take over the sovereignty, cannot be stopped by a resolution of Congress. The only answer to a ruthless political action group, determined to destroy the honor [of] America, is a political action group determined to support American political ideals and defend the men in government who are loyal to them.

We have talked loosely and superficially about this rival power system. But talk is no longer good enough.

We have called the product the Acheson foreign policy. This dual control of foreign policy was operating in our government as early as 1940 under Harry Hopkins.<sup>84</sup> It operated under Dean Acheson,<sup>85</sup> but it has operated just as effectively since he left. We have no reason whatever to think this group lost its hold because Mr. Acheson resigned. Everything we know indicates the contrary.

Who then are the people we are discussing? Where do they operate? On what foundation does their power rest?

## THEY DO NOT OPERATE CONSTITUTIONAL RESTRAINTS

Part of our confusion comes from the fact that this group does not operate along Constitutional lines at all. Our legal foreign relations staff works in the State Department, under the direction of the President, and within the policy framework laid down by Congress. But the extra-legal foreign policy-making conspiracy operates all over the lot. Like a cancer growing wild, it ignores all the restraints inherent in a healthy well-balanced organism. This collectivist machine operates, in part, in the State Department, in part, in the White House Secretariat, in the super-Cabinet agencies of national defense, in the Foreign Operations Administration, in the CIA. But a substantial part of it operates outside government. It may be found in the press, in the parties, in the colleges, in labor unions, in business, in the United Nations. The important point is that all the parts of this political machine are coordinated. They operate, as one, from some control tower we cannot see.

We have tried to blame our Presidents, the State Department, the party in power, for our failures in foreign policy. I am convinced we shall never recognize

<sup>83</sup> A bill enacted by Congress in 1955 that secured an American commitment for the defense of Formosa against invasion by the People's Republic of China.

<sup>84</sup> One of President Franklin Roosevelt's closest advisors, he was the chief diplomatic advisor to the President in World War II as well as a key policy maker.

<sup>85</sup> He was Secretary of State in the Truman Administration from 1949 to 1953. He played an important role in defining American Foreign Policy during the Cold War.

the octopus we have to fight until we realize it is not part of the legally established government at all. It is a revolutionary junta, operating within our government, and through our government, but not for our government, our Constitution, or our nation.

What keeps this cabal in power, under Democratic and under Republican administrations? Why has it been impossible for three Presidents and many Congresses to demolish it? That is a long story but it can be summarized in three p's, pressure groups, propaganda and pelf – that is, big spending.

You are going to ask me whether this group is entirely Communist directed. I doubt if our problem is that simple. This group has, we know, included Communist Party members and Communist agents, and may still include them. It includes Socialists, collectivist one-worlders, ambitious individuals greedy for power, willing in time of trouble to advance themselves at the expense of their country. It includes trimmers and collaborators who believe they can make deals with the unscrupulous, who think they can get votes or power or contracts or publicity, from the Communists, and then cast aside their tempters. It includes the innocent and the simple-minded, who love big words that have no meaning.

I do not know what proportion of these people are Communists, but I know for certain that everything they do is of benefit to Moscow, because it is directed by Moscow. The Soviet leaders are the most skillful people in the world today in the new political arts of propaganda, brainwashing, camouflage, and what I have called revolution by assembly line. We can save ourselves a great deal of time and thought if we realize one fact. As conditions are today, the Communist world revolution will control and use all the bits and pieces of collectivism, one-worldism, centralism, internationalism and all their variations. None of them will be helpful to us.

How are we going to redress the balance, and give the strength to the vast majority of true Americans, so they can manage their own government?

We must give up our reliance on legalism.

The pro-Communist, internationalist, collectivist foreign policy, with its favoritism for everything, which helps the Soviet Union, has triumphed again and again because of the energy, intelligence, and determination of self-directed elite. We fight this advancing army with statements, promises, papers and laws. We will never win until we oppose the collectivist political faction with resolute political action by men determined to put America first.

The pro-American group within our government today is more numerous, abler, stronger, more devoted, than the collectivist group. It is supported by the vast bulk of the voters of both parties. Its weakness is that it is trying to win a debate under the rules of American political life. It should be fighting for victory over opponents who know no rules.

### PRO-AMERICANS ARE UNDER ATTACK

We must know first the names of leaders of the pro-American group. You can find our [sic] who lead the American branch of our two-headed government

by the enemies they have made. The left-wing press and the collectivist collaborators are always ready to attack Secretary of Defense Wilson. They center much of their fire on Admiral Radford.

Kruschev<sup>86</sup> [ ]<sup>87</sup> speaking in Red China last fall, violently denounced Admiral Radford, and bracketed him with the Communist-hated Senators Knowland<sup>88</sup> and McCarthy. Isn't it significant that left-wing American columnists today follow exactly the line spoken by Kruschev four or five months ago?

You remember this bloc did not exactly like MacArthur. They denounce the Senators who support the free nations of Asia. They criticize President Eisenhower if he dares cooperate with Republicans they have not recommended.

The collectivist press has not yet started to attack Herbert Hoover, Jr.,<sup>89</sup> who is now our Under-Secretary of State, but it is a rule of theirs never to call attention to good people on our side until they have to. Assistant Secretary of State Robertson<sup>90</sup> has escaped their attack for the same reason.

Today pro-American officials have not one moment's security. They are constantly under attack, mostly by moves they cannot see. If you need a blueprint of how the collectivists keep dangerous anti-Communists under constant pressure, I suggest you analyze the series of moves which they employed to destroy Senator McCarthy, from the day in Wheeling, West Virginia, when he tore down the curtain of censorship hiding the Communists in our State Department.<sup>91</sup>

I tell you just such a subtle, complex, perfectly timed, secret campaign is already under way against the mean [sic] who dared advise the President to resist the Chinese Reds. The strategy is worked out, and broken into steps. It will arise, "spontaneously," from all directions. It will be echoed in all quarters of the world. The "line" is already apparent in the inspired British press and that of the Continent.

From a well-informed left-wing magazine I learn the shape of coming events. Once the UN is well in the picture the plan is to "build up enough pressure to

---

<sup>86</sup> Nikita Khrushchev served as the First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union from 1953 to 1964.

<sup>87</sup> Section was omitted from original document.

<sup>88</sup> William Fife Knowland, Republican Senator from California. He was Senate Majority Leader (1953-1955) and Senate Minority Leader (1955-1959).

<sup>89</sup> Herbert Hoover, Jr., was Under-Secretary of State from October 1954 to February 1957.

<sup>90</sup> Walter Robertson was the Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs from April 1953 to June 1959.

<sup>91</sup> Speech given in 1950 in which Joseph McCarthy claimed that he had a list of Communist sympathizers and party members working within the State Department.

make imperative the gentle liquidation of Chiang Kai-shek,<sup>92</sup> and the establishment of true self-government for the Formosans under UN trusteeship.” But, my friends, the Nationalists are not Formosans. Self-government will give the island to its pre-war inhabitants. Can you see the Nationalist armies, driven from Formosan soil by a demand for “neutrality”, wandering like a ghost army about the world, as helpless as General Anders valiant Polish fighting men?<sup>93</sup> Next we are told “binding multilateral agreements for the reduction of armaments are imperative.” These agreements will bind us but not the Communists. Finally we are told “Then the gamble that the President has taken will start paying off. The greater his success, the more likely he is to acquire the freedom of action he needs to (and I urge you to note) shed his most troublesome aides.”

### ONLY POLITICAL ACTION WILL SAVE US

The bloc which intends to destroy the true Americans in our government is in action. Is there a bloc to defend the true Americans and drive out the secret enemies of our country? I am not urging you to help our friends in Asia. I am urging you to prevent the humiliating defeat of our country and everything it stands for.

You ask who are the leaders of the collectivist bloc. Who is taking Acheson’s place today?

I can guess but I have no legal proof. Remember, the physician cannot have proof that his diagnosis is correct. He can get that only from the autopsy.

But I want to point out one significant fact. We are never going to have legal proof, about the most dangerous enemies of our country. We will not be able to use what proof we have when the culprit is close to the top. Attorney General Brownell<sup>94</sup> and J. Edgar Hoover<sup>95</sup> told us how FBI reports on Harry White,<sup>96</sup> for example, were sent to President Truman, and his Cabinet officers again and again. We know President Truman and his top Cabinet members opposed promoting Harry White to the International Monetary Fund, in view of his record. But he was promoted.

Who could tell the President of the United States he must promote a known Communist collaborator? I have been told who was the person responsible but I have so far no proof. Shall we sit and do nothing, when we have political proof

<sup>92</sup> Served as the Generalissimo of the Republic of China (ROC) from 1928 to 1975. He became the President of the ROC in 1948 under the 1947 Constitution of the Republic of China

<sup>93</sup> General Wladyslaw Anders served in the Polish Army after it was resurrected in 1918-19. At the onset of World War II, the army was weak and could not hold against the German and the Russian forces. It was therefore helplessly trapped between two aggressors.

<sup>94</sup> Herbert Brownell, Jr., was the Attorney General under President Eisenhower from 1953 to 1957.

<sup>95</sup> John Edgar Hoover was the Director of the FBI from 1924 to 1972.

<sup>96</sup> He was an American economist and U.S Treasury department official who was accused of engaging in espionage activity for the Soviet Union.

that some of our officials are selling out our country, merely because we have no affidavits of what was said in their secret conferences?

One thing we know. The Communists and their collaborators push their best men close to the top, because that is the safest place to be. No one could remove Dr. John from his job in Germany though more than one person knew he was disloyal. We may get the little traitors by assembling legal proof. We will never get the big ones, except by political counter-attack.

The pro-Communist attack on our political institutions is political action. We must use political action to remove from public life every man or woman who is beholden to the Communists, or committed to a philosophy alien to our Constitution. We cannot wait until we see a party card.

### POLITICAL ACTION WILL BRING ABOUT AN AMERICAN POLICY

We must also know American policy. It is all very well to know Communist policy, but it is more important to know American policy.

We must have a clear American foreign policy and a clear American military policy before we enter any conference with other nations in the United Nations or outside.

There is no harm in conferring with foreign governments, inside or outside of UN, so long as we put America first.

Nationalist China has perhaps half a million men eager to fight for their independence.

Korea has courageous soldiers ready to fight on their own soil. Indo-China can provide others, with American training. Altogether Free Asia can furnish millions of troops eager to guard their sectors of the frontier of freedom.

Can we guarantee that no one in our State Department or FOA<sup>97</sup> will hamstring the funds Congress has voted to arm them? Can we guarantee that agencies or our government will not conspire to undermine Chiang Kai-shek or Syngman Rhee<sup>98</sup> or Vietnam? If the great brains, who have abandoned newspaper work for pontificating, sow planned confusion or attack our pro-American leaders, are we ready to meet them with better newspapers, better writers, better radio and television programs, or, if necessary, by mimeograph machines in every block?

The Chinese Communists have started four wars in Asia in the last ten years, with no penalty. The Red Chinese know they can never put down the Chinese on the Mainland, while the Chinese on Formosa have an army. They will never be satisfied with less than total destruction of that army. They must destroy the armies of Korea and of Indo-China. They count on the aid of their supporters in our councils.

Support of the armies of Free Asia is American policy, as destruction of these armies is Communist policy.

<sup>97</sup> Foreign Operations Administration.

<sup>98</sup> President of South Korea from 1948 to 1960.

The Communist regimes are weak and their people rebellious. The only strength they possess is the faction within the American government which puts the Soviet Union first.

We must deal first with our own dual government. If we will organize political action, to support the pro-Americans in our government and in public life, the world conflict will soon be over. We can win true peace for all the world if we will gird ourselves to defeat the enemy within.



## Letters Received by William Jenner Regarding his February 14 Address

*The next four letters are in support of William Jenner and his speech delivered in Dallas. Two of these letters are from his constituents, while the other two are from concerned Americans from Illinois and Texas. The authors express their agreement with the points Jenner made throughout his speech, as well as their eagerness to take action for Jenner's cause.*

February 17, 1955

Hon. William E. Jenner,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir:

Thank you very much for sending me a copy of your address, "Let's Put America First," which you delivered in Dallas this week.

I wish to congratulate you upon your excellent delineation of a most vital topic. Your analysis of the Communist influence in our government, and its dire threat is brilliant and penetrating. Your speech is a call to action, and should be required reading for every American.

If you can spare a dozen copies of your address and send them to me, I shall see that they are placed in the hands of individuals who will give it wide circulation.

You will be interested to hear that there is a group of people in Westchester County who are actively engaged in arousing public opinion to the peril of the Communist conspiracy. This group is doing exactly the type of work which you have shown to be so necessary.

As an indication of our activities, I am enclosing a piece of literature which has been issued by the Rye unit to enlist support of our organization, and enlarge our influence at the local level.

Our group stands squarely behind you in your fight to preserve free America.

Very sincerely yours,

Robert A. Wright



Fort Worth, Texas  
February 18, 1955

Honorable William E. Jenner  
United States Senate  
Washington 25, DC

Dear Senator Jenner:

The speech you made in Dallas on the fourteenth was a masterpiece. I never expect to hear a better one – and from all the comments I've heard, that seems to be the general impression you left. Although there were a number of people there from Fort Worth, I won't rest until some way, some day, we can arrange to have you speak in our city, too.

You stressed the need for a strong political action group to combat this powerful unseen force that actually operates and formulates policy for us outside the constitutional boundaries. You are so right! We know it exists – and we know it to be a weblike thing – woven in to every department of government – with heavy emphasis on the State Department – and working against the best interests of this country. This prompts me to say – 'Move over Denmark – there's something rotten here, too.'<sup>99</sup>

But seriously, how do you start a strong pressure group to fight this evil? What would be the most effective way to do it? I know there are enough people interested in saving our America to be effective if they band together. But it will take organization and co-ordination of effort to make our sting felt in the right places. I am wondering whether you have any ideas along this line.

This unseen force that governs us without the consent of the governed – since we don't get to elect any of them – must be stopped in their tracks before it is too late. Since we can't see them, don't know who they are in most cases we face a rather difficult foe to wage battle on. We can worry our own Senators and Representatives with letters when we disapprove of their actions. And sometimes they appear to listen because we do mean a vote. But what can we do to bring pressure to bear on dastardly (and I hate to spell that with a D – its too mild) outfits that don't depend on anybody's vote to stay where they are? This is a problem, isn't it?

By the way I am interested in finding out whatever happened to your S. Res. 247<sup>100</sup> which you submitted (for yourself and the late Senator McCarran<sup>101</sup>)

---

<sup>99</sup> A paraphrase of a quotation from William Shakespeare's Hamlet, "Something is rotten in the state of Denmark." Hamlet. Act I, Scene IV.

<sup>100</sup> The Senate resolution which expressed that the U.S. Senate needed to sever diplomatic relations with Russia as well as to organize an international conference to take action against communism worldwide.

<sup>101</sup> Senator Pat McCarran (D.-Nev.) died in September, 1954. McCarran was known for being intensely anti-Communist.

in May 1954. The last I heard of it it was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. It probably hurt the feelings of some old foreign relation of ours so it was shelved.

Keep daring to tell the people truth. We have all too few like you.

My Best,

Mrs. Stella Lydick  
A Texas Valentine



5020 Bryce  
Ft. Worth, Texas

Feb 16, 1955  
Senator William E. Jenner  
Senate Office Bldg  
Washington D. C.

Dear Senator Jenner:

I have just finished reading the speech you delivered in Dallas. There may have been a few people that were amazed at your revelations but not many. We have known for too long that this thing was happening to our country. Let me assure you that my following remarks do not mean you personally. I only wish we had 95 more senators with as much devotion to America, as much integrity and loyal patriotism as you have shown in the past.

Please do not put too much blame on the voters. We did the best job we could with the tools we had. Please do not excuse Congress, because you have the power in your hands to stop a lot of Congress argues [sic], but then they vote the huge appropriations to the big unnecessary agencies to spend at will. Big spending has not been reduced under the new administration in spite of pre-election promises. As for propaganda, Congress votes millions to be used for this purpose and although we pay the bill, we don't know what is being said. (Voice of America)

Although many of us have forgone a new formal for the New Years Eve dance and will forgo the feminine thrill of a new spring hat so we could add a few dollars and even nickels and dimes to pay for the paper and postage for the battle of the mimeograph machine to tell the other side of the story to our friends and neighbors, we can begin to compete with BIG money. I mean the Foundations.

There is where the secret government and vicious propaganda is coming from. You know the story of the I. P. R.<sup>102</sup> Tonight Dulles<sup>103</sup> is telling the Foreign Policy club of New York, supported by the Foundations,<sup>104</sup> what our position will be in regards to Formosa<sup>105</sup>. Reflect for a moment the number of educational (?) societies and leagues being supported by tax exempt foundations. Just look at the members of these same organizations. All of them with power, audience, and influence on our legal government with the weight of millions to use as pressure.

No matter how righteous is truth, we cannot compete with these evil men who control the millions. But Congress could equalize it by taking away the tax exemption and then investigating, no need to make reports and speeches about our two headed government. We know what happened to the Reece committee,<sup>106</sup> but if Congress cannot or will not put a check reign on the impudent destruction of our beloved country, God knows we will never stop it by agitating for an intelligent primary vote.

We have wasted too many years to try a program of political education now. We no longer have any choice at the polls as far as principles are concerned and very probably the next election or two we will no longer even have a choice of names. Our only choice will be between ballot or bullet.

Sorry this is so long. I have refrained from writing to you too often because there is no need to wear you out. There is too few of your kind left.

Don't ever think we out here in the sticks do not know what is going on in spite of the slanted press. We know we have a two headed government and we also know one head has two faces. We hear words about defending our noble ally on Formosa but we know it is in the picture to sell out our last remaining friend on this earth to the United Nations.

---

<sup>102</sup> Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR). Established in 1925, the IPR sought to provide a way for discussion of the issues and relations between countries of the Pacific Rim to take place. Important figures of the IPR were prominent foreign policy experts on the Far East in the State Department. This area of the State Department was heavily targeted during the McCarthy accusations. It was widely believed that the IPR was composed of Communists, though there is speculation as to how many were involved.

<sup>103</sup> John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State under Dwight D. Eisenhower from 1953 to 1959.

<sup>104</sup> The Foundations refers mainly to the Carnegie Corporation and the Rockefeller Foundation. These two foundations heavily financed the Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR).

<sup>105</sup> Current day Taiwan in East Asia off the coast of mainland China.

<sup>106</sup> The Reece Committee, 1953-1954, chaired by B. Carroll Reece (R.-Tenn.), investigated tax-exempt foundations. The committee looked specifically into the grant making policies of the Carnegie Corporation and the Rockefeller Foundation, among others.

This could go on for pages, please forgive my long and tiresome letter. It won't happen again.

Sincerely

Edith L. Storey  
2342 Winton Ave  
Indianapolis 24, Indiana



Ellenwalt Hotel,  
Watseka, Ill  
Feb. 15, 1955

Hon. Wm. E. Jenner,  
Senate Office Bldg.,  
Washington D.C.

Dear Senator:

Enclosed is a clipping from the Chicago Tribune reporting on your address at Dallas. If this speech is being printed I would like very much to have three copies. I would like one for myself and the other two for heads of the patriotic organizations with which I am associated.

Would you please do me a favor? I am enclosing a tear sheet from today's Chicago Tribune of a full-page advertisement of a book which has just come out. I ordered a copy of this book and have read most of it. I recommend it to anyone who is interested in the government.

Will you please forward this large clipping to the Chairman of the Senate Committee which is to pass on the Federal Budget. I think ever [sic] member of the Congress should have this book on his desk and use the material in it to combat pressure groups which are constantly asking for more money.

For example, I have a clipping here on my desk from the Christian Science Monitor (AP Report) concerning the USIA – United States Information Agency's budget for the next fiscal year. They are asking for \$88,500,000. which is \$11,386,000. more than they used last year.

In this book BILLIONS, BLUNDERS AND BALONEY pages 116 to 134 are devoted to the author's personal observations of this monstrous agency and its

appalling waste of the taxpayers' money. The advertisement says "This book will make you mad." I can testify to the truth of that prediction because, although I knew a lot of this stuff before, reading a summary of the whole sordid program of profligacy makes me sick at heart to think what the "SECRET CABAL" which you speak of, has been doing to us.<sup>107</sup> If you can get in a plug for this book on the Senate floor I am sure you will be doing great service for the long-suffering American taxpayer. This book is being widely publicized throughout the country and I feel sure that there is going to be an outpouring of righteous indignation which the administration had better listen to.

Kindest personal regards,  
Yours truly,

Austin Mosher.



---

<sup>107</sup> Reference to Senator William Jenner's speech on February 23, 1954

## **Billions, Blunders and Baloney:**

### **The Fantastic Story of How Uncle Sam is Squandering Your Money Overseas**

By Eugene W. Castle

*The advertisement from the Chicago Tribune included in the letter from Austin Mosher to encourage Jenner to read the book, Billions, Blunders and Baloney, which emphasizes the seriousness of government waste. This book was written in 1955 by Eugene W. Castle. According to the biographical text at the end of this book, Castle was “an expert on propaganda and promotion.”<sup>108</sup> His first major project occurred during World War I when he worked with the Marines’ Central Recruiting District on enlistment propaganda. He founded Castle Films in 1923, and, from that point on, he was a distributor for the U.S. government of movies and materials concerning the armed forces. He wrote The Great Giveaway: The Realities of Foreign Aid in 1957. Billions, Blunders and Baloney was published by the Devin-Adair Publishing Company, which shifted its publishing focus in post-World War II America to books concerning conservative, anti-Communist, and libertarian ideals. In 1952, it published McCarthyism: The Fight for America by Senator Joseph McCarthy. The following document is an advertisement for the book, Billions, Blunders and Baloney, and it was included in a constituent’s letter to Senator Jenner.*

# “BILLIONS, BLUNDERS and BALONEY”

*Never before—such a timely exposé... never before—such damning evidence.*

“It is an appalling story, most of which, I am sure, is unknown to the American people. I felt that the story should be told so that they might know what they are buying with their billions.”

These are the words of Eugene W. Castle, author of “Billions, Blunders and Baloney.” Now ask yourself

---

<sup>108</sup> Eugene W. Castle, Billions, Blunders and Baloney: The Fantastic Story of How Uncle Sam is Squandering your Money Overseas. (New York: Devin-Adair Publishing, Co., 1955).

- Is the money you spend to combat communism really “doing the job?” Or are American dollars actually creating more Communists?
- Is it true that U.S. payrollers abroad are living and spending extravagantly?
- Why are “Yanks Go Home” signs appearing everywhere from Paris to Tokyo?
- Are Communists turning U.S. propaganda to their own advantage?

No matter which side of the political fence you're on, you'll be fascinated and aroused by the startling accusations of a man who traveled 75,000 miles through 23 foreign countries and spent three years digging out information on why the United States is becoming the world's most unpopular country while spending billions to try to win foreign friends! Newsmen, motion-picture and propaganda authority, EUGENE W. CASTLE directed the United States Government's nation-wide film activities to thousands of defense plants, plus Army, Navy, and Red Cross film programs during World War II. Written in down-to-earth language, his charges of “failures, blunders, wrong guesses, bad timing, and gross extravagances of unqualified policy-makers” will start controversies raging. This book will make you mad. You may not agree with it, but you'll be talking about it, hearing about it, arguing about it with your friends in your social group, at your office, at your club!



## Letter from Senator Joseph McCarthy to the President of the United States

*This letter from Senator Joseph McCarthy, Republican representative of Wisconsin, to President Harry Truman was written three days after McCarthy's famous Wheeling Speech. This speech signaled McCarthy's rise to influence, as he gained national attention by producing a piece of paper on which he claimed he had listed the names of 205 members of the Communist Party working secretly in the U.S. State Department. McCarthy was, at the time of this letter, beginning to exploit national concerns about Communist infiltration during the Cold War. This fear of infiltration was intensified by the Soviet Union's recent development of the atomic bomb and the coming Communist takeover of China. "McCarthyism" however was not yet at its peak. Senator McCarthy here at first encourages President Truman to commit more resources to the war of containment being fought in South Korea, and secondly questioned the legitimacy and effectiveness of Truman's loyalty program, signed into effect by Executive Order 9835 in 1947. This program required the FBI to run checks on almost anyone involved in the U.S. government and subsequently to launch investigations into any government employee with what could be presumed as questionable political associations. The Loyalty Program was not enough to satisfy Senator McCarthy, who suspected that a number of subversives had slipped through the investigation and remained in the State Department. President Truman made it clear that he would not take McCarthy's accusations seriously and that the Senator was "the best asset the Kremlin has."<sup>109</sup>*

July 12, 1950  
The President  
The White House  
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. President:

Today American boys lie dead in the mud of Korean valleys.<sup>110</sup> Some have their hands tied behind their back, their faces shot away by Communist machine guns.

They are dead today not because they were less brave or had less to fight for than the North Korean Communists who manned those machine guns, but because the program adopted by this Congress to avoid just such a war in Korea, and signed into law by you, Mr. President, was sabotaged.

Last year Congress voted money to fortify South Korea and to help Anti-Communist forces in the entire Asiatic area. One item of \$75 million was

---

<sup>109</sup> Arthur Herman, *Joseph McCarthy: Reexamining the Life and Legacy of America's Most Hated Senator*. (Free Press, 2000), 131.

<sup>110</sup> The Korean War started on June 25, 1950, and ended with the signing of an armistice on July 27, 1953. This letter was written seventeen days after the war officially began and sixteen days after U.S. began supporting the Republic of Korea (ROK) in South Korea.

appropriated; another of \$27,600,000; another of \$10,300,000.

As you and all of us know the program for military aid to South Korea was sabotaged to the extent that only \$52,000 worth of wire out of the above millions appropriated was sent to Korea with which to stem the threatened onslaught of Communist planes, tanks, artillery, etc.

While the Russians were sending to North Korea tanks, artillery and planes, our State Department “experts” on the Far East were sabotaging our programs to militarily aid the Korean Republic, and Secretary of State Dean Acheson was announcing to the world that we would not aid the South Koreans if they were invaded. We can assume that not only were the North Koreans listening, but Stalin as well.

Two of those State Department experts, Mr. Jessup<sup>111</sup> and his super-advisor Lattimore,<sup>112</sup> were telling the world that Korea did not count in the Far East defenses of Democracy. Lattimore, as you will recall, Mr. President, publicly stated that our only problem in Korea was to let her fall without having it appear that we pushed her to her doom.

It does not seem improper, Mr. President, to ask at this time why it is that Mr. Acheson could expedite a \$60 million order of guns and bullets for Communist Poland, but did the opposite for the anti-Communist forces in South Korea.

Obviously, as President you must rely on the advice of others. Men, both great and small, have been betrayed by advisers in the past. It is understandable that a President can be betrayed by his political friends. But it is not understandable nor excusable if he keeps those political friends in positions of power after they are exposed as betrayers not only of him but of the nation.

At this time I would like to bring to your attention documented facts showing how your own well-meaning program<sup>113</sup> to clean the subversives out of government, which program was initiated in 1946, was sabotaged by those advisors whom you apparently still trust. In 1946 the attention of Congress was directed to disloyalty in the government when the Carl Marzani<sup>114</sup> case was broken. As you know, he was one of the top State Department employees convicted of perjury in connection with his Communistic activities.

---

<sup>111</sup> Philip Jessup was a focus of Senator McCarthy’s attacks, and his name was brought up often during the Tydings Committee hearings.

<sup>112</sup> Owen Lattimore, an author, scholar of Central Asia, and professor at Johns Hopkins University; Senator Joseph McCarthy accused him in 1950 of being a Soviet espionage agent because of his position as an expert on the Far East in the State Department.

<sup>113</sup> Executive Order 9835, also called the Loyalty Order, was initiated by President Truman to examine the possibility of Communist infiltration in various departments within the federal government. Of the more than three million federal employees investigated, roughly three hundred were noted as risks and asked to leave.

<sup>114</sup> Carl Marzani was a member of the Communist Party of the United States (CPUSA) yet concealed his membership while serving in the OSS, the Office of Strategic Services, during World War II.

In response to the growing demand in Congress at that time, you ordered, and Congress later approved, a Federal loyalty program.<sup>115</sup> \$11 million was appropriated to put that program into effect.

The proof of how this program was sabotaged is attached hereto in the form of photostats of signed statements from people who were hired by the State Department to assist in the job – people who now come forward with nothing to gain and at least one of whom has a job to risk by giving this information.

One of these individuals now works for the State Department. Another is third-year student at Georgetown University; a third is in private industry; a fourth is presently an FBI agent.

You will note that the name and other job information contained in the statement of the State Department employee has been blocked out in the photostat. This was [sic] done because this man gave the statement only on the condition that his name not be used and he get no publicity in connection therewith. However, if you will give me your personal assurance that his job will not [be] endangered thereby, I am sure I can obtain his consent to let his name be given to you.

Three of the four innocents, as far as they were concerned, took part in a file stripping operation fully described in the statements. Their statements refer to the files as personnel files. These files became the present loyalty files after the loyalty program was put into effect. They were hired by the State Department and paid with public funds to destroy files which had been built up at tremendous cost and labor in order to protect the security of this nation.

This information is being brought to your personal attention for two specific reasons.

(1) When I started to expose Communists, etc., in the State Department, you condemned my methods and stated that if I had brought the information to you, you personally would have taken the necessary steps to correct the situation.

(2) The following sequence of facts prove that it would be worse than useless to present this information to the Tydings-McMahon committee<sup>116</sup> which your Administration selected to do the job of exposing Communists in our State Department.

When I stated that the State Department loyalty files were rifled and that important material was missing, the chairman of the committee held a press conference and answered with a studiously false assertion that the FBI had examined all the files and found them complete and intact.

This was not the truth. With my knowledge of and unlimited respect which I have for the FBI and having knowledge of the extent to which those files had

---

<sup>115</sup> This loyalty program created loyalty boards, ordered the Justice Department to produce lists of dissident organizations as well as possible subversives, and granted authorization to dismiss “security risks” without producing explicit evidence.

<sup>116</sup> Subcommittee on the Investigation of the Loyalty of State Department Employees. This committee was convened in February 1950 to investigate the claims of Senator McCarthy.

been denuded, I knew that this statement was not the truth. Mr. Tydings must also have known it.

I attach hereto a photostat of two clippings – one from the New York Times, the other from the New York Herald Tribune, quoting his statements at that time. I could not prove that his statement was false without the document which I now have in my possession. That document is attached hereto. It is a letter from the FBI director, J. Edgar Hoover.<sup>117</sup>

I call your attention to paragraph two, which reads as follows:

“The Federal Bureau of Investigation has made no such examination and therefore is not in a position to make any statement concerning the completeness or incompleteness of the State Department files.”

Certainly under the above circumstances, no one can honestly claim that the majority members of this committee under the leadership of Senators Tydings<sup>118</sup> and McMahon<sup>119</sup> are attempting to get the facts. Certainly no one could honestly urge that material as important as that being submitted to you today should be submitted to the Tydings-McMahon committee – unless of course we were willing to follow in the footsteps of that committee and trim the facts to fit the political cloth of men afraid to face the truth.

For those reasons this material is being presented directly to you, Mr. President.

There are those who have made pleas for unity in this time of crisis. I join them in that plea, but I must define that unity to the point where it will have meaning for those we send today to Korea to fight and die.

We must all be unified in our loyalty to this nation. There is no place in a hot war for men with lukewarm loyalty.

There was never a place for them in the cold war. But they were there.

Even in normal times, the information given you would be shocking. Today, however, it is doubly shocking because of the disastrous sequence of events in Asia, which today has brought us to the very precipice of defeat by the Communist half of the world. It reveals the groundwork laid for keeping and protecting people in the State Department who are unfit to serve this country.

Why would the State Department find it necessary to strip the files unless the information, when placed before the loyalty boards, would have caused the removal of those individuals. The stripping was successful to the extent that this nation was and is being betrayed. For proof you need merely look upon the chain of events which have lead to the repeated disaster for the United States and victory for Russia in Asia.

Today Korea is the crisis area. Where will it be tomorrow if the same men act as your advisors and mold your thinking Mr. President?

---

<sup>117</sup> John Edgar Hoover was the Director of the FBI from 1924 to 1972.

<sup>118</sup> Senator Millard Tydings, a Democrat from Maryland, served in the Senate from 1927 to 1951.

<sup>119</sup> Senator Brien (James O'Brien) McMahon, a Democrat from Connecticut, served in the Senate from 1945 to 1952.

The magnitude of this file stripping operation is better understood when you realize that it took six months to strip the State Department files of information on the disloyal, and bad security risks, the fellow travelers and the traitors, and it took a crew of eight to do the job.

You will note that the statement of one of the young men who took no part in the file stripping job, but who had the task of making out cards on the clean files, shows that he was advised that the State Department employees were allowed to inspect and rifle their own files.

If this was an accepted procedure during the cold war, what is now being done in fraud and deceit and [sic] now that the real day for the traitors to do their work is at hand?

Someone in the State Department ordered the files stripped. Who was he? He must be found, Mr. President. And when found you decide how close he is to the top of the list of those who pledge their allegiance to the Soviet Union. You decide whether he is merely a dupe or guilty of high treason.

There are those who say we should not now spend time searching for those responsible for the disasters of the past few years. Common horse sense dictates, however, that in order to protect America in the critical weeks, months and years ahead we must determine who in positions of trust seek to betray us, and then act to get them out of government. If allowed to remain, they will undoubtedly tip the scales for disaster and against victory for this nation.

Respectfully yours,

JOE McCARTHY

## Letters to Senator William Jenner

*Three letters to William Jenner commending him for his vote against the censure of Senator McCarthy in 1954. These letters were contained in the William E. Jenner Collection of the Archives of Hanover College.*

*Dated only a day after the Senate voted on the censure of Senator Joseph McCarthy, this letter reflects the patriotic and fervently anti-communist attitudes of its composer, who remained an anonymous American from Los Angeles. Unfortunately for this writer, "Tail-Gunner Joe" was condemned on the two counts of dishonorable and disreputable conduct with which he was charged.*

Los Angeles, Calif.  
December 3, 1954

Senator  
Senate, USA.  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator:

Thank you for your vote against the Censure of McCarthy. We still have hope. For, it is recorded in the Bible, where God said if He could find but only one righteous man in it He would not destroy the city.<sup>120</sup> Allright [sic], we have here twenty men who are stand [sic] on the side of our fight to save our nation against the Godless forces of evil intent. Stand, stand, and stand! One on God's side—a majority.

We need a few more men of the McCarthy bent, men who get serious and irked at what is going on here in our midst whilst our men are being killed abroad in our defense. We need a few more voices crying in the wilderness this evil generation. History should teach us a few things. No nation has ever stood for long after it allows itself to be unfruitful and drunken.

We need leader [sic] who will not sell out, be bribed and deceived by these forces of evil both within and without. Jesus said the good Shepherd doesn't desert his sheep when the wolves attack. He leads them out, "and the sheep know his voice."

Thank you and God bless you



---

<sup>120</sup> King James Bible. Jeremiah 5:1

*The following letter was written to Senator William Jenner, who was one of Senator Joseph McCarthy's greatest allies. The date on the letter placed it just days after McCarthy was officially censured by the Senate by a vote of 67 to 22. This came after the famous Army-McCarthy hearings and several months of Senate investigations of McCarthy's actions and accusations. Despite the views expressed by this constituent of Senator Jenner's, McCarthy's approval rating was very low at this time; he had lost the confidence of the American people.*

Madison County Chapter  
American Gold Star Mothers, Inc.  
Elwood, Indiana  
Dec. 6th, 1954.  
Hon William Jenner.,  
United States Senate.,  
Washington. D. C.

Dear Senator:

What ever happened to the Government by the people for the people ? What is happening to our beloved country ? Are we deliberately turning it over to the communist ?

What a shameful set of the Presidents [sic], to endorse the work of the Watkins committee<sup>121</sup> on the censure issue, and not one word of praise for the work done by Senator Joe McCarthy. How does he expects [sic] us parents to give our sons to fight this evil, when our own government is allowing it to flourish here in our country. ? [sic] or to allow a Senator to be censured for fighting the pinks here in the good old U.S.A. ?

Well I hope that the 20 real American Senators who voted against the censure move, will band together and try and support a third party ticket, lets face is [sic] the Republican party is dead. We want a party whos [sic] first interest will be America. and to rid our country and government of all the pinks, and communists who are at the helm now.

Some one ought to go after Senator Morse,<sup>122</sup> and censure him, he's done enough of damage to the republicans, and now he is out to get McCarthy expelled from the Senator [sic]. And Senator Flanders<sup>123</sup> should also be censure[sic] not only for starting this mess, for some very un answered [sic] questions you put to him, and he could not answer.

---

<sup>121</sup> Senate committee led by Arthur Watkins, a Republican from Utah, to evaluate McCarthy's tactics and to determine whether he should be censured.

<sup>122</sup> Wayne Morse, Independent (at that time) Senator from Oregon who condemned McCarthy's tactics as early as 1950.

<sup>123</sup> Ralph Flanders, Republican Senator from Vermont who introduced the 1954 motion to the Senate to censure Senator McCarthy. He publicly compared McCarthy to Hitler.

I do not believe the 12 million people who signed [the] petition against the censure move, are going to take this lying down. I am afraid something will come of all this. It's a poor state of affairs, when the peoples [sic] voice has no meaning any more. God Bless you for the splendid work you are doing, and that goes for McCarthy, Knowland,<sup>124</sup> Bridges,<sup>125</sup> Bricker,<sup>126</sup> and many others.

Sincerely Yours.

Mrs. Sylvia Sykora



Dear Senator Jenner,

Thank you very much for putting up such a good fight for Senator McCarthy and Americanism. Your 22 men<sup>127</sup> will be a powerful force for the good of our country, and will win out, for there is nothing more powerful than being right.

All good wishes  
G. Bacon  
Newtonville, Mass.

---

<sup>124</sup> William F. Knowland, Republican Senator from California, Senate Majority Leader 1953-1955; known as the "Senator from Formosa" for his support of the exiled national government of China.

<sup>125</sup> Henry Styles Bridges, Republican Senator from New Hampshire, Senate Minority leader 1952-1953, Senate President Pro Tempore 1953-1955.

<sup>126</sup> John Williams Bricker, Republican Senator from Ohio, former Governor of Ohio 1939-1945.

<sup>127</sup> Twenty-two United States Senators voted against the censure of Senator McCarthy.





To "Bob + Barb" With Best Personal  
Wishes.  
Bill Kinner

*Image: Harris & Ewing, Washington, DC, c.1950. Courtesy of the Archives at Hanover College.*

## Statement of William Jenner

*After the Senate voted to censure Joseph McCarthy in December 1954, the senator's meteoric rise to fame ended in a symmetrical plunge into infamy, effectively concluding his career in the Senate. Two and a half years later, on May 2, 1957, McCarthy died from hepatitis, which many believe stemmed from alcoholism. The senator received a state funeral at St. Matthew's Cathedral in Washington, D.C., which was attended by seventy senators. His casket was then flown back to Wisconsin to be buried, accompanied by three senators, one of whom was William Jenner. It is no surprise then, that Senator Jenner delivered to the Senate the following statement honoring his fallen colleague. In it, Jenner explained that McCarthy was human and fallible but that, while his actions may have been questionable, his character and purpose were not. In the final lines of the document, Jenner warned his fellow senators to remain wary of the threat of Communists in the government because Joseph McCarthy was no longer there to do the job for them.*

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM E. JENNER (R-IND.)  
IN THE UNITED STATES SENATE – AUGUST 14, 1957

The story of Joe McCarthy will be repeated wherever the history of our time is discussed. Joe McCarthy lived his political career in the very storm center of the most insidious danger which has ever faced our country and the world.<sup>128</sup>

This is not the time or the place to go into the political controversies which rent our domestic life into warring factions.

Our purpose here is to pay tribute to a friend and fellow Senator.

A little episode will give the quality of the man. A visitor to Washington was busy at a party, denouncing Joe McCarthy and his works. When he finished, the guest he was addressing put out his hand with a friendly smile, and said "I'm Joe McCarthy. Let's talk it over."

Joe McCarthy was human. He had weaknesses, like all of us. When he was cut with knives, he bled. But he had a fighting heart. He fought the enemies of his country to the best of his powers. But when men he admired seemed to desert him, his heart broke.

Joe McCarthy loved his country. He loved the State he represented. Like so many men who have fought in battle, he felt a sense of love and protectiveness for the younger men sent into new wars. Joe McCarthy did not end his service to his country when he left the armed forces. It was inconceivable to him that mere boys should be sent into battle to fight Communists in Asia, while men in high office were unwilling to fight communists at home.

Joe McCarthy loved the Senate. He respected and admired his colleagues, especially the men who served for years before he came in, with the post war class of 1946.

---

<sup>128</sup> Sen. Joseph McCarthy died May 2, 1957, at the age of 48.

When he entered this Chamber, to take the oath to support the Constitution; when he sensed suddenly, in the midst of the daily trifles, that the Senate was molding the Law by which our nation lives; when he looked, at evening, toward the dome of the Capitol against the sky, he felt a kinship with all the men who have served in Congress, with all the men who have tried in their separate ways to make America strong and free.

He was proud that he, a farm boy, had been chosen by his own people in Wisconsin, to represent them in the Senate of the United States. At moments he must have thought, as we all do, that if his father and mother could look down and see him, they would be happy to see what their son had done.

If Senator Joe McCarthy had been a petty or a vengeful man, he could have used the vote of censure to tear the Senate of the United States into bitter factions. But he understood the Communist mentality too well. He knew that was what they wanted, and what they expected. He would not injure the Senate of the United States, to get a little personal revenge.

Once the vote was cast, he asked nothing of his supporters. He turned a smiling friendly face to his traducers. No man in public life has been more shamefully maligned. For the first time in our history, I believe, the meanness of his enemies pursued a man beyond the grave.

We misunderstood his gentleness. We did not know his heart had broken. We did not know that the mainspring was gone. Nothing could erase from his memory the fact that friends and colleagues, all patriots and men of good will, had voted to censure his conduct as a Senator. For what reason? Because he believed Communists should be driven from places of honor and trust in the United States.

Joe McCarthy was vindicated again and again. Even the Internal Revenue Bureau proved the dishonesty of the petty personal charges brought against him, by returning taxes he had overpaid.

But when the months dragged by, with no effort by his colleagues to rescind the cruel misjudgment they had placed against him, his tired heart could bear no more.

There is only one service we can do now for Joe McCarthy, one recompense for what he suffered. We can each make a solemn vow to understand the danger that faces our country, and take up the burden that has fallen from his hands.

Senator McCarthy believed in what the Communists sarcastically call the conspiracy theory of history. We know well the evidence that the Communists are trying to conquer the world, by conspiracy if possible. Karl Marx turned his own venomous hatred of his own country into the doctrine that the proletariat of the world should [sic] make war on patriots of all countries and destroy all nations. Lenin remade Karl Marx's doctrine of open war into a plan for secret conspiratorial assault on the peaceful governments of other countries. Out of the hatred, and frustration of the oppressed in Imperial Russia, Lenin fashioned his strategy for turning the discontented into a secret order, dedicated to destroying all peaceful nations by subversion.

Forty years have passed since the Russian Empire collapsed but the Communists still use methods derived from the conspirators who fought the might of Czars and their secret police. Stalin consistently proclaimed his devotion to the same corrupt and poisoned doctrine, born in the garrets and Siberian prison camps of Czarist Russia.

Krushchev has said only recently that the Communists would adhere to that doctrine of violence and hate, until shrimps learn to whistle.

Why was it wrong of Joseph McCarthy to believe Lenin and Stalin and Krushchev? Can anyone offer one single bit of evidence to discredit the statements of these highest Communist authorities that they still intend to remake the world by secret conspiracy? Can any man, of even moderate intelligence, believe they intend to subvert the world, but spare the United States?

The active fight against Communism has receded since Senator McCarthy was censured for daring to bring the fight to the people. But the danger is still as great as ever. Krushchev himself has told us so.

The burden of post-war fatigue lies heavy on Americans, as it does on the people of the rest of the world, including Soviet Russia. Wars have become to [sic] heavy for mortals do [sic] bear. Nearly all nations have suffered a loss of political vitality.

We do not have the fresh confidence that Joe McCarthy had, when he came new to the struggle with Communism. But the battle fatigue does not mean political impotence.

We are not ready today for a new crusade against Communism. But we can do something much simpler. We can each of us, as individuals, show utter contempt for the Benedict Arnolds who have betrayed us.

The American people know who are the men who have bowed to Communist pressure. We do not need any legal briefs or court procedures. We need only a healthy political instinct for survival.

Let us each of us here resolve that we shall never again have any dealings with any one in public life who has gained office or wealth or influence, by catering to Communists or their well-disguised pressure groups.

Let us not smile at them or touch their hands or tell them of our thoughts or listen to theirs. Let us not do business with them. Let us include them in no act of fellowship.

No American is too busy or too tired to choose non-intercourse with all cynical collaborators with Communism, as we would refuse our fellowship to Benedict Arnold if he was in our midst today.

I say that Joe McCarthy terrified the Communists because their hold was weak, not strong. I say the Communists, as such, have no real power to destroy our country, dangerous and destructive as they are. The alliance of the Communists with the ambitious and the timid is the only danger to America. If we break that alliance, if we end all the political advantages of collaboration, victory will be certain.

Joe McCarthy believed that no Communist, no pro-Communist, no person

soft on Communism, no one who had made a deal with Communism, has any right to a place in the American government or in any position of trust or leadership over the American people. He believed there is no place for any pro-Communist anywhere in our military establishment, where he can betray our fighting men. He believed there is no place in either of our great political parties for the mean-spirited connivers and makers of deals, who were willing to see America destroyed, if they could gain a little political advantage.

We can best pay our debt to the memory of Joe McCarthy, to the other Americans who have suffered in the fight on Communism here at home, and to the men who lost their lives in open war against Communism in Korea, by cleansing America of every last remnant of unclean Communist thought and vicious Communist power, until our country shall achieve a new birth of freedom out of the fires of that conflict in which Joe McCarthy of Wisconsin laid down his life.

I know the American people will never give up the fight. There is no decadence in our people, only in our institutions. As the Chaplain of the Senate said, when we met here to hold the final services for Senator Joe McCarthy, the Members of Congress are the watchmen on the city walls, whose duty it is to warn the people before the danger strikes. One of the watchmen has fallen. The task falls on us, his colleagues, to stand guard until all danger to our country is ended.

--THE END--

## Letters to The Post

*The following letters reveal the Patriotic attitude felt by Americans in response to the fear of Communism specifically during the Second Red-Scare of the Cold War. The amalgamation of tones in both letters are optimistic, sanguine, and expeditious. When calling for action from its audience, the letters emphasize American values in addition to leaving the reader with a sense of duty to provide for future generations of Americans, free of Communist ideals in favor of freedom and liberty during a pivotal, but rather uncertain time in the course of American political history.*

### **What Post Readers Say: Hurting Morale**

To the Editor of The Post:

Sir- The greatest secret weapon that has enabled the United States to win all wars and retain our freedom has been the fearlessness and innate daring of all our fighting men.

Marxism knows it must destroy in order to control the world. Hence the publicized lists of U.S. prisoners and the tortures they undergo are intended to put fear of capture into the hearts of young America.

It is time we had an administration equally fearless as our soldiers, who would drop the words "consistent with our foreign commitments" and "feasibility" or "short of war" and acquire a new "pro-American" vocabulary consistent with the bravery and devotion of our fighting men and would say we will rescue our soldiers by "any means necessary."

The present Washington attitude of "fear and uncertainty" will eventually destroy the morale of our soldiers and all America because Marxism is planning it that way.

G. BACON,  
Newtonville.

Dear Fellow Patriot:

You have indicated an interest in preserving our Country, and shown an awareness of the dangers that threaten our way of life.

Possibly you have asked yourself the question, "What can I as an individual do to check the spread of Communism?" The answer is, that if you have a thorough understanding of its deadly menace, your personal influence can have enormous weight.

That is the reason why a group of your fellow-citizens have banded together to oppose Communistic influence wherever it rears its ugly head, whether in the schools, the press, the government, or elsewhere.

We want to look ahead to the day when this country will regain its national respect at home and abroad. We want to look ahead to the day when this nation will again have the courage to defend its citizens and its rights.

The plan of operation is to form small groups of individuals, who will hold semi-monthly meetings, with a concrete program of discussion and action. You can form such a group among your personal friends, who think as you do.

Every assistance will be given by the unit which is already functioning. To acquaint you with the operating procedure, you are welcome to attend one of our meetings, or a member of the group will help you organize a new unit.

BE ALERT, BE INFORMED, BE ACTIVE in the fight against the powerful forces which are seeking to overthrow our country.

Let us know how we can help you. Don't Delay.

Yours in God and Country,

CARD-CARRYING AMERICANS<sup>129</sup>

---

<sup>129</sup> Likely a tongue-in-cheek reference to the use of cards to identify Communist Party members.

