Lesson Procedures: Truman’s Loyalty Program

Framing Question: Do Cold War fears during the Truman Administration justify the institution of the government Employee Loyalty Program in a democratic society?

Note- This module is organized around four basic steps essential to an inquiry. You are welcome, and encouraged, to tailor these steps to the needs of your students. Younger students might need additional direction and collaboration is provided here.

Step 1: Framing the inquiry

1. Students should restate the inquiry question in their own words, establishing exactly what it is asking. Students might work with a neighbor to predict what possible perspectives might be available on the question.

2. An essential component to discussion of this topic is the historical context. Ideally, this lesson would follow discussion of the end of World War II (including Yalta and Potsdam), rebuilding Europe via the Marshall Plan, the policy of containment in both Europe and Asia. Although many of the sources in this lesson predate the Korean War, it might be helpful to do this lesson as an investigation of the “Cold War at home,” so the lesson likely could follow an examination of containment in Asia. Regardless of where the lesson falls in the scope and sequence of the course, it is important that students understand the larger context. In addition to the framing question, students should generate a list of questions that they need to know regarding Cold War politics and foreign policy in order to proceed. These questions should include background knowledge they anticipate needing or related questions that they find interesting. Students will use these questions to help guide how they examine the sources and what additional resources they might request.

Examples of questions for this lesson might include:
* Why was Truman committed to containment?
* Why did Truman find it necessary to establish the Loyalty Program?
* Why was Truman uneasy about the Loyalty Program?
* How did the public react to the Loyalty Program?
* How did foreign policy developments between 1945 and 1950 shape Cold War fears at home?
* In what ways does the Loyalty Program reflect the Cold War fears at home?
* How did the Loyalty Program impact government workers?
* How is the Loyalty Program, which was practiced in the Executive Branch of the federal government, relate to the rise of Senator Joseph McCarthy in the Legislative Branch?
* What is the legacy of the Employee Loyalty Program?
* How might the Loyalty Program relate to current issues?

3. Discuss the above questions as possible historical context points. Students should keep in mind the overall tenor of the Cold War as they examine the documents and the essential question. Perhaps have students create a short timeline of some of the foreign
policy developments from 1945-1950 so they can place the documents in context of those other issues.

4. The background essay focuses primarily on the Loyalty Program as it relates to the larger context. Teachers may wish to present this essay (and other sources if desired) to give students context for the inquiry. Consider the following strategies to make this effective:
   a. The students or teacher might read the essay aloud, establishing the main point of the reading.
   b. The teacher may choose to lecture the material in the background essay or assign it to be read individually.
   c. Revisit the question. How does this information change or expand our understanding of what the question is asking? How does it affect our initial understanding?
   d. Student should re-read the essay individually, looking for information that might provide answers or clues to their original questions. Students might be asked to record their questions and answers in a class notebook.
   e. Other activities might involve:
      i. Opening up the document- research topics that are new or confusing.
      ii. Using context to infer meaning of new words/phrases
      iii. Compare the essay to other sources (textbook, articles) on the same topic.
   f. Create a graphic organizer that might help organize evidence collected from the sources. Students may wish to add information from the essay to the foreign policy timeline.

**Step 2: Go to the sources**

*Note- each source should be looked at separately for information that will help reveal perspectives on the question. Consider the following steps with each source, understanding that students will need less assistance as they repeat the process.*

1. All sources have a story. They were produced by a person at a time and place in history. The instructor should model how to analyze these circumstances in order to predict their influence on the content of the source. These include:
   a. Examining the creator, predicting what this person might create based on who they are.
   b. Considering the intended audience of the source, predicting how the content might be influenced its format and purpose.
   c. Brainstorm the context of the source, paying particular attention to the events, attitudes, and forces at work at that time and place.

2. Use all of this information to predict the reliability and utility of the source. History students should recognize that all sources are worth investigating even if they represent a viewpoint not recognized by themselves or other sources.
3. Students should view sources like a detective looks at a crime scene. Each source should add information towards the questions established in step 1. To support student success consider the following steps:
   a. Students look over the source to get a general idea of the content.
   b. Determine whether or not predictions were accurate.
   c. Ask questions, researching or working with other students to clarify confusion.
   d. Examine the format of the source. If necessary, model the kinds of questions to ask or details to pay attention to that are specific to that format.
   e. Categorize the source based on its perspective. Which possible answer does this source support?
   f. NOTE: discussion questions are provided following each source.

Step 3: Reviewing the evidence

Note- By reviewing sources, students should have gathered many ideas that are relevant to the question. This step allows learners to look at this evidence and decide what it actually reveals. What is the best interpretation based on the evidence?

1. Go back to Step 1 and review the possible interpretations of the answer predicted by the class. How many of those panned out? What additional interpretations were exposed through the rest of the learning?
2. In groups, students should use evidence collected to identify multiple or competing interpretations to the question.
3. Direct students to complete the graphic organizer, “Weighing the Evidence,” which asks students to categorize the documents as their perspectives illustrate opposing viewpoints on the Loyalty Program. Students should categorize the documents with key pieces of evidence from the documents that support the categorization. They should not just write “Source 1,” etc. on the graphic organizer, but should include key details from the document.
4. Small group discussion of the evidence:
   a. After students have categorized the documents, consider facilitating small-group discussions of their categorization. Students should discuss why they categorized a document as they did on their graphic organizers, using specific details from the documents to support their categorization.
   b. Following discussion of categorization, students may begin to grapple with the essential question in their groups. What does the evidence show in terms of a response to the framing question?
5. Socratic Seminar: Pose the framing question as a class discussion prompt. As a facilitator, teacher may wish to remind students of importance of context to this discussion. Remind students that the transition from World War II to Cold War was so quick that Truman and his advisors were acting quickly on many decisions. How does that shape student opinion on the framing question?

   *Possible extension: Lead into McCarthyism to explore how the Legislative branch responded to some of the same Cold War fears. Many Republicans in Congress felt Truman's
Loyalty program was not enough to meet the threat of communism at home. Refer students to specific documents that might illustrate this, and discuss how McCarthyism and HUAC grew during the same period.


**Step 4: Communicating an answer**

Note- By communicating an answer to the framing question students are accomplishing several thinking tasks at once. The teacher does not have to assess everything a student does but should be aware of the importance to model and/or provide quality examples so that this format doesn’t get in the way of students sharing what they have learned from the documents. If you have been working specific types of writing or speaking, consider working this step around those goals.

1. Provided in the materials for this lesson is a resource entitled Answering the Question. In determining the product of learning for this lesson consider the following criteria.
   a. What is the skill level of my students?
   b. What literacy goals can I support with this product?
   c. Does the format of the product allow students to communicate a claim and use evidence from the sources to support it?
   d. Can students have a say in what they produce to show their learning?
   e. Do all students need to have the same product?
2. Construct a rubric for the product, careful to assess student proficiency towards your class learning goals. A sample rubric is provided following this step.
3. Provide students time to create their initial product in class allowing collaboration as needed. Consider having students get feedback from peers at multiple points in this process. When soliciting feedback from a peer a student should first identify what he/she would like help with, then be prepared to ask for help and input.
4. Before collecting student work, consider having students self-assess their work using the rubric. This is an important step that will help them take more ownership in their ultimate grade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P= Your main idea</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1- Below Basic</th>
<th>2- Basic</th>
<th>3- Proficient</th>
<th>4- Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is not able to demonstrate any part of this task.</td>
<td>Can create a claim only with guidance from the instructor.</td>
<td>Creates an appropriate claim on a topic but is clearly introduces and stakes out a position on the topic.</td>
<td>Clearly introduces the range of possible answers on a topic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E = Evidence you have to support your main idea.</td>
<td>Is not able to introduce or give further explanation to the idea.</td>
<td>Generally alludes to evidence but does not cite it, or draws from only one account;</td>
<td>Refers to relevant and accurate evidence from more than one source and links it directly to specific accounts, mentioning the accounts by name.</td>
<td>Seamlessly integrates evidence from multiple sources by accurately summarizing details and using source information to establish its relevance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E = Evaluation and Explanation of your evidence</td>
<td>Is not able to demonstrate any part of this task.</td>
<td>Distinguishes or sorts between evidence that is/is not relevant to answering a question or explaining a point of view.</td>
<td>Accurately explains the significance of the evidence used to answer the question.</td>
<td>Accurately explains the significance of evidence used and evaluates the reliability or utility of the available sources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L = Link to context/content</td>
<td>Is not able to introduce any part of this task.</td>
<td>Provides a general conclusion sentence that summarizes the main point of with no specific link to the point.</td>
<td>Links the back to the original point by summarizing how the evidence supports the main idea.</td>
<td>Links back to the original point by both placing the evidence within historical context and by summarizing how the evidence supports the main idea.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because document-based activities begin with a question, the most natural way to assess students’ learning is to have them answer the question. Typically this involves structuring and organizing evidence in order to complete a formal essay writing. While the informational essay is certainly an important skill in a social studies classroom there are also many other valid ways to have students create well-reasoned explanations based on available evidence. Consider the following options for students to answer the guiding question.

1. Allow students to use the RAFT format, guiding them to select some or all of the following variables for student writing: Role, Audience, Format, Topic. Examples:
   a. Role: Truman, Audience: Press, Format: Speech/Press Release, Topic: Justifying Loyalty Program (an excerpt from one of Truman’s speeches defending the program is provided in supplemental documents)
2. Direct students to write an argumentative essay based on the guiding question.
3. Ask students to evaluate the documents provided in the activity, ranking the usefulness of each in answering the guiding question.
4. For AP students: Use the documents to answer the following DBQ in preparation for the AP Exam: Analyze the factors that led to creation of Truman’s Loyalty Program. (contextualization/causation)
The Cold War emphasis on containment is often framed in terms of Truman's foreign policy decisions: the Marshall Plan and Truman Doctrine in Europe, the Korean War in Asia. Yet containment took on a life of its own in the United States as many Americans grew more and more concerned about Communism on U.S. soil, and even more alarmingly, in government agencies. The rise of McCarthyism in the wake of this fear is well-known. Less discussed, perhaps, is the emergence of a Loyalty Program within the federal government.

Truman's Loyalty Program has its origins in World War II, particularly in the Hatch Act (1939), which forbade anyone who "advocated the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States" to work in government agencies. After the war, tension with the Soviet Union grew, as did suspicion of workers in every government department. Several advisors, including Attorney General Tom Clark, urged Truman to form a loyalty program to safeguard against communist infiltration in the government. Initially, Truman was reluctant to form such a program, fearing it could threaten civil liberties of government workers. However, several factors shaped his decision to institute such a policy. Fear of communism was growing rapidly at home, and in the 1946 midterm election, Republicans gained control of Congress for the first time since 1931. To examine the issue, in November 1946 Truman created the Temporary Commission on Employee Loyalty, which stated, "there are many conditions called to the Committee's attention that cannot be remedied by mere changes in techniques... Adequate protective measures must be adopted to see that persons of questioned loyalty are not permitted to enter into the federal service." In March 1947, Truman signed Executive Order 9835, "prescribing procedures for the administration of an employees loyalty program in the executive branch of the government."

The Loyalty Program has been criticized as a weapon of hysteria attacking law-abiding citizens. The Attorney General's office compiled lists of "subversive" organizations, and prior involvement in protests or labor strikes could be grounds for investigation. As the Cold War intensified, investigations grew more frequent and far-reaching. As noted in Civil Liberties and the Legacy of Harry S. Truman, edited by Richard S. Kirkendall, "During the loyalty-security program's peak years from 1947 to 1956, over five million federal workers underwent screening, resulting in an estimated 2,700 dismissals and 12,000 resignations... the program exerted its chilling effect on a far larger number of employees than those who were dismissed" (70).

While Truman feared the Program could become a "witch hunt," he defended it as necessary to preserving American security during a time of great tension. Many Americans agreed with him and applauded his stand against communism and subversion. The historical context of this event is important, for every investigation, every loyalty oath and every questionnaire took place under a backdrop of fear in an uncertain post-war world.

It is common today to look at events like McCarthyism, HUAC and the Loyalty Program as products of hysteria. Yet this hardly was the first time the federal government restricted civil liberties in the name of national security. In 1798, Congress passed the Alien and Sedition Acts as concerns over a looming war with France. During both the Civil War and World War I, individuals suspected of disloyalty faced imprisonment. The liberty vs. security debate is a continuity in American history, and even though we live in a post-Cold War world, some of these issues are still part of the discussion in an age of global terrorism. Truman's Loyalty Program must be viewed and debated with this understanding, and the understanding that historical context drives presidential decision making.

**Essential Question:** Do Cold War fears during the Truman Administration justify the institution of the government Employee Loyalty Program in a democratic society?
iii. a statement as to his right of hearing, if he so desires, at which he may personally appear with counsel or representative of his own choice, and witnesses, and present evidence, including affidavits, in his own behalf.

c. When a Loyalty Board recommends removal there shall be, prior to removal, a right of appeal under provisions prescribed by the head of each department or agency.

d. The rights of hearing, notice and appeal shall be accorded to all employees, irrespective of tenure or manner, method or nature of appointment.

Under Paragraph 3d of Executive Order No. 9896, it is recommended as follows:

The underlying standard for either the refusal of employment or removal from employment in loyalty cases shall be that, on all the evidence, reasonable grounds exist for believing that the person involved is disloyal to the Government of the United States. Individual employee activities and associations which may be considered in this connection include one or more of the following:

i. Sabotage, espionage, or attempts or preparations therefore, or knowingly associating with spies or saboteurs;

ii. Treason or sedition or advocacy thereof;

iii. Advocacy of revolution or force or violence to alter our constitutional form of government;
iv. Intentional, unauthorized disclosure to any person of documents or information of a confidential or non-public character obtained by the person making the disclosure as a result of his employment by the Government of the United States;

v. Performing or attempting to perform his duties, or otherwise acting, so as to serve the interests of another government in preference to the interests of the United States;

vi. Membership in, affiliation with or sympathetic association with any foreign or domestic organization, association, movement, group or combination of persons, designated by the Attorney General as totalitarian, fascist, communist, or subversive, or as having adopted a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force or violence to deny others their constitutional rights, or as one which seeks to alter our form of government by unconstitutional means.

Under Paragraph 3e of Executive Order No. 9806, it is recommended as follows:

a. That the temporary legislation by which the Secretaries of the War, Navy and State Departments can presently remove any employee summarily for security reasons be made permanent because of the sensitive nature of the operations of these three departments, and that permanent legislation of the same character be enacted to grant similar power to the Atomic Energy Commission.
b. That all of the recommendations contained in this report be effectuated by the promulgation of an Executive Order which will simultaneously provide for the abrogation of Executive Order No. 9300, dated February 5, 1943.

In conclusion, the Commission recommends that this report, together with any Executive Order which the President may issue, be submitted to Congress for consideration.

A. Devitt Vanech
Chairman

John E. Peurifoy

Edward H. Foley, Jr.

Kenneth C. Royall

John L. Sullivan

Harry B. Mitchell
Using Source 1

| Sourcing Questions | This document was produced by Truman’s temporary commission on government loyalty. What do you notice about the signatures at the end of the document? What do they tell you about who served on this commission? Why might that matter?  

*(NOTE for teachers: All of the commission members were white males. This would be typical for a government commission in 1946, but it is worth discussing with students. Many of those accused were women or African-American. No women or African Americans served on the temporary commission or on the Loyalty boards. This was a complaint of many who opposed the program.)* |

| Contextualization Questions | *Why is the date of the document important? What was going on prior to this commission’s report? How quickly did America go from WWII to the Cold War -- and how does that add meaning to the document?  

*Communism was an attractive ideology to some during the Great Depression. How close was this document released to that era? Why is that important?* |

| Corroboration Tasks |  |

| Close Reading Questions | Examine specific “grounds for suspicion of disloyalty.” Why might some of these criteria raise concerns? |
EXECUTIVE ORDER

PRESCRIBING PROCEDURES FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF AN EMPLOYEES LOYALTY PROGRAM IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

WHEREAS each employee of the Government of the United States is endowed with a measure of trusteeship over the democratic processes which are the heart and sinew of the United States; and

WHEREAS it is of vital importance that persons employed in the Federal service be of complete and unswerving loyalty to the United States; and

WHEREAS, although the loyalty of by far the overwhelming majority of all Government employees is beyond question, the presence within the Government service of any disloyal or subversive person constitutes a threat to our democratic processes; and

WHEREAS maximum protection must be afforded the United States against infiltration of disloyal persons into the ranks of its employees, and equal protection from unfounded accusations of disloyalty must be afforded the loyal employees of the Government:

NOW, THEREFORE, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes of the United States, including the Civil Service Act of 1883 (22 Stat. 403), as amended, and section 9A of the act approved August 2, 1939 (18 U.S.C. 611), and as President and Chief Executive of the
July 5, 1946, 60 Stat. 453, or of any other statute conferring the power of summary removal.

4. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard, are hereby directed to continue to enforce and maintain the highest standards of loyalty within the armed services, pursuant to the applicable statutes, the Articles of War, and the Articles for the Government of the Navy.

5. This order shall be effective immediately, but compliance with such of its provisions as require the expenditure of funds shall be deferred pending the appropriation of such funds.

6. Executive Order No. 9300 of February 5, 1943, is hereby revoked.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Mar. 27, 1947.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Using Source 2</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sourcing Questions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contextualization Questions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corroboration Tasks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Close Reading Questions</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. President,

I consider your executive order against "disloyalty" in government workers a bigger threat to me and my friends than to civil servants and traitors. I don’t see how you can keep it from becoming a preying, suspecting, disturbing shadow in the lives of any progressive people in the country.

We’re doing fine with an unadulterated bill of rights. If the order becomes law, I consider it reason enough to deny you my vote in 1948.

Respectfully,

David J. Sloane
Using Source 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sourcing Questions</th>
<th>The source line does not indicate who David J. Sloane is. Given your reading of the document, who do you think Sloane might be? What is his point of view?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contextualization Questions</td>
<td>Sloane give us an important piece of historical context in the last line of this letter. Why might that be important?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corroboration Tasks</td>
<td>In what way does Sloane’s letter attempt to challenge Truman’s explanation for the Loyalty Program, as presented in Source 2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Reading Questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEADING AMERICANS WARN OF DANGERS IN ORDER 9835

LAGUARDIA Warns of Danger
"It is safe to predict that the very people who urged and now approve the Executive Order will realize that it is entirely too one-sided and smacks too much of autocratic power, methods of a police state, and contains many of the attributes which we criticize in other countries and which are repulsive and repugnant to American tradition and American principles."

HENRY WALLACE Sees Witch Hunt
"Intolerance has an insatiable appetite. Whom will its inquisition condemn if this drive continues? Every American who reads the wrong books; every American who thinks the wrong thoughts; every American who stands up for civil rights; every American who believed Willkie; every American who supported Roosevelt. Hatred and violence abroad, hatred and fear at home will be the fruits of the Truman Doctrine."

PHILIP MURRAY Condemns Order
"As carefully as I have read this Order, I cannot find clear guarantee of due process, whether with respect to specific charges being made available, or to the opportunity to confront accusers and cross-examine witnesses, or to any of the traditional protections afforded all our citizens under the laws of the nation.

I am alarmed at the prospect that any organization of citizens, gathered together to express their ideas on matters of mutual interest, may be declared "subversive" without any specification, definition or limitation of the meaning of that term. There is no assurance in the Order that fraternal or religious associations, labor or consumer groups, literary or educational organizations or institutions, may not be so labeled forthwith."

HARVARD Professors Dissent
"It is imperative to keep clearly in mind what a dismissal under the order means. Far more is involved than the loss of a job. It means that:

(1) The person dismissed will be denied all opportunity for employment anywhere in the Federal Government.

(2) As a practical consequence, he will also lose almost all possibility of finding employment within any state or municipal government.

(3) Also, he will encounter special difficulties in obtaining employment in private organizations.

No-provision is made for a detailed record of the hearing or, for that matter, for a record of any kind. There is no requirement that the findings of the loyalty board must be supported by the evidence."

Zechariah Chafee, Jr., Erwin N. Griswold, Milton Katz, Austin W. Scott.

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT Voices Fear
"However, the more I think about one clause in the President's Executive Order, the more troubled I am. Under the clause I am afraid it would be possible to declare subversive many organizations that are simply in opposition to the thinking of certain powerful groups."

WRITE OR WIRE PRESIDENT TRUMAN TODAY
URGING HIM TO RESCIND EXECUTIVE ORDER 9835

UNITED PUBLIC WORKERS OF AMERICA, CIO

Washington, D.C.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Using Source 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sourcing Questions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contextualization Questions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corroboration Tasks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Close Reading Questions</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution

Organized April 28, 1889
Incorporated by Act of Congress June 3, 1906

President General
A. HERBERT HODGSON
Western Union Building
Nashville, Virginia

Vice-Presidents General
CHESTER H. MARTIN
Deputy United States Marshal
Rochester, New York

President
W. W. M. BLAND
Washington, D.C.

Secretary
THOMAS H. DARLING
1227 16th Street, N.W.
Washington 6, D.C.

Treasurer
WILLIAM W. PETERS
4710 potato St., Washington, D.C.

Mason E. Mitchell
Coffey, Arkansas

Theodore C. Fryer
Salt Lake City, Utah

Adj. Gen. Henry G. Mathews
San Francisco, California

The following states are represented by the members of the Society:

1. New York
2. Pennsylvania
3. Maryland
4. California
5. Michigan
6. Virginia
7. Ohio
8. Texas
9. Kansas
10. Missouri

Act of Congress for the Incorporation of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution of 1889.

July 2, 1947.

Honorable Harry S. Truman,
President of the United States,
The White House.

Dear Mr. President:

It gives me great pleasure
to enclose a Resolution passed at the National
Congress of the Society of the Sons of the
American Revolution assembled at Huntington, West

We feel quite sure you will be interested
in this action of our National Society.

Cordially yours,

Frank B. Steele,
Secretary-Registrar General,
National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution.

cc: Pres. Gen., S.A.R.
RESOLVED, by the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution in Congress assembled at Huntington, West Virginia, May 15, A. D. 1947:

1. That we are gratified by the action of the President of the United States because of his Executive order of March 22, 1947, wherein he has set new standards of loyalty for employees of the United States Government, and has requested a Congressional appropriation of funds to put such standards into effect;

2. That such Executive Order, if enforced by Congress and the Department of Justice, will make it unlawful hereafter for officials of the Government of the United States to have membership in, affiliations with, or sympathetic association with any foreign or domestic organization, association, movement, or combination of persons designated by the Attorney General as totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or subversive, or as favoring any policy which would overturn our American System by force or violence, or any unconstitutional means; and we are gratified also that if such Executive Order of the President is enforced that it
will mean a quick discharge from the Government service of all public officials now in such service whom the Federal Bureau of Investigation may find to be members of any such organizations as are hostile to our system of government and in their hearts loyal to alien systems of government.
July 7, 1947

My dear Mr. Steele:

The President has asked me to thank you for your letter of July second, with the enclosed copy of resolution adopted by your organization. He wants you and your associates to know that he is especially grateful for this kind expression of approval.

Very sincerely yours,

MATTHEW J. CONNELLY
Secretary to the President

Mr. Frank B. Steele,
Secretary-General,
National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution,
1217 16th Street, N. W.,
Washington 6, D. C.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Using Source 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sourcing Questions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contextualization Questions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corroboration Tasks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Close Reading Questions</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The President
The White House
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. President:

For a long time the Committee on Un-American Activities has been striving diligently to unearth the facts of the Communist conspiracy in the United States and its infiltration into the Government service. It has been necessary to do this because your administration has failed to keep the people informed about this dangerous situation which now belatedly is being recognized for what it really is. Why you and your Attorney General have attempted to obstruct and thwart our pursuit of the facts can best be answered by yourself.

The evidence of Communist espionage was laid on your desk more than three years ago. Since that time can you recall one action that has been taken to punish those guilty of spying in the United States? Where and when has your Attorney General prosecuted in public courts a single agent of the Russian espionage ring? The evidence has been gathered diligently by the FBI for many years. Why has it been allowed to gather dust in their files?

Several weeks ago, when we were conducting hearings on Communist espionage activities within the Government, you attempted to dismiss and discredit these hearings as being "a red herring." At a later press conference, you reiterated this charge. Apparently you have found out on your tour that the people did not agree with you, for I notice in
reading the text of your speech which you gave yesterday in Oklahoma City, that you stated as follows:

"The FBI has been quietly and efficiently assembling this evidence for several years. The evidence was being presented to the Grand Jury long before the Republican Congressional Committees began their recent hearings. Now these Committees are trying to win credit for digging up evidence. They are trying to cash in on the work of the FBI, and to usurp the functions of the Grand Jury and the Federal Courts."

I assume from the above statement that you have concluded that it was not a "red herring" after all. Further in your speech you made some ridiculous accusations against the Committee on Un-American Activities—accusations which I call upon you now to substantiate by the facts:

1. You stated that this Committee "has made confidential information available to the intelligence services of foreign countries." What information are you referring to? Please name it.

2. You state that this Committee has "injured the reputations of innocent men by spreading wild and false accusations." Who are the innocent men? Please name them.

3. You state that "the Committee has also deprived the Government of the services of a number of atomic scientists." Who are they? Please name them.

Your Attorney General, in a speech given on September 22, in Washington, D. C., in defending your loyalty program, stated:

"The President's program has not ended with the investigation of Federal employees. Thirty-four persons have been convicted in the Federal Courts in Washington, D. C., since July 1, 1945."

Let me have the facts on this also, Mr. President, because I am sure that you will find that most of them resulted directly from the work of this Committee and were cases of subversives who had been certified to the United States Attorney by the House of Representatives, after exposure by our Committee.
I realize, Mr. President, that this is a blunt request, but your attack upon this Committee cannot be left unchallenged.

As Chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I do not intend to be deterred or intimidated by personal attacks upon me by the President of the United States, or by political-serving announcements by the Attorney General, for I shall continue to expose the participants in this communist conspiracy whether they be Government employees, scientists, diplomats, labor leaders, or movie stars.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]
Chairman.
### Sourcing Questions

J. Parnell Thomas served in U.S. Congress. Given the tone of the document, what party do you think he represented? When was this document written? How long after the executive order is that? What does that show you about Thomas’ view of the program?

### Contextualization Questions

September 1948 is very close to the 1948 Election. Just as Truman was facing reelection, so was Thomas. How might that shape your reading of this document?

### Corroboration Tasks

In what ways do the ideas of this document compare with those in other sources?

### Close Reading Questions

Thomas references HUAC several times. What does Thomas seem to be stating about the Executive vs. Legislative branches approaches to Cold War at home?
March 31, 1948

The Honorable Harry S. Truman
President of the United States
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. President:

I am well aware of the burdens of your office, and it is not my intention to impose on your time and good nature.

Enclosed you will find for your consideration a full page Anti-Communist advertisement of March 29, 1948 from the Hartford Courant, stressing the importance of democracy and a factual condemnation of Communism.

Any favorable comment from you on the nature of our work will strengthen our organization and help us carry on our work for God and our Country.

Respectfully yours,

Albert B. Epstein

Albert B. Epstein

AMERICAN ANTI-COMMUNIST LEAGUE, Inc.
AN OPEN STATEMENT
BY
AMERICAN ANTI-COMMUNIST LEAGUE
P. O. Box 1967 — HARTFORD, CONN.

Since the days of the Pilgrim Fathers millions of people the world over have left their homelands and loved ones and travelled thousands of miles across the seas with only one hope in their hearts — to find a better life for themselves and their children in the U. S. A.

We of the American Anti-Communist League like most Americans are at a loss to understand why the Communists and their fellow-travellers, who extol Soviet Russia and claim it to have a much superior system to ours, fail to take advantage of this great Marxian paradise.

Why don't these Communists leave the shores of this "Capitalist Infested Country" for the much better life in the land of the Soviets?

We, on our part, are ready and able to help the Communists of America to achieve their heart's desire for a better life in the land of Stalin's Utopia. Therefore, the American Anti-Communist League makes the following offer —

We will supply a first-class ticket from the U.S.A. to MOSCOW by Air Clipper or Steamship entirely free and paid by the American Anti-Communist League to any Communist or his fellow-traveller who wishes to renounce his American citizenship and guarantees to never return to the United States.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Albert L. Epstein, Pres.
311 Trumbull St., Hartford, Conn.

Hugh F. Hayden, Sec'y.
158 Seymour St.
Hartford, Conn.

Arthur Makris, Treas.
120 Oakland Ter.
Hartford, Conn.

Robert F. Wetherell
73 Lincoln St., Hartford, Conn.

Althea L. Johnson
31 Lisbon St., Hartford, Conn.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sourcing Questions</strong></th>
<th>The author of this document is a member of what organization? What can you hypothesize this document will say before you even read a word of it?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contextualization Questions</strong></td>
<td>How does the presence of this organization and the message of this document reflect what was happening in both foreign and domestic policy at this time?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corroboration Tasks</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Close Reading Questions</strong></td>
<td>The tone of this document is an important piece of it. What key words show the tone?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 14, 1951

Dear President Truman:

I have just listened to the rebroadcast of your talk today before the American Legion in Washington. I agreed with a great many of the things you had to say about how our country is being turned into a spineless, hysterical land by people who prey upon fears and use slander, guilt by association and character assassination to build suspicion and close-mindedness. And I agree with you that unless people of strength and character get up the nerve to put a stop to this we'll have no democracy left to defend against possible aggressors.

As I listened, however, there were several things that disturbed me. There seemed to be inconsistencies. Because I've always considered that you are an honest man (perhaps this is in itself an indication of how much all of us -- even supporters -- are infected with the disease of suspicion of the people we would ordinarily never think of doubting), I've decided to take them up with you directly.

In all sincerity, this is what bothered me. I am impatient with myself for having to apologize for daring to differ with my President -- how effective is the fear of being called a Red because I exercise my right, even my duty, to express honestly the things I wonder about). As I listened, I asked myself, "Where did all these things start? How did we get sucked into this whirlpool of fear and doubt and slander?"

And I realized, of course, that it started right in Washington. Not in the halls of Congress, where it has been nurtured into such a prosperous, vicious handmaiden, but in the executive branch. What set the pattern for the test of guilt or innocence by association but the loyalty programs? Where did the conclusive evidence of a man's Americanism originate but in the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations?

This is a tough situation, I know. I do not question the necessity of a government's setting up standards to weed out people who work their way into sensitive positions to do spying or sabotage for a foreign power. But how can I reconcile this reasonable necessity with the sweeping, all-pervading snooping into the lives and thoughts of decent people who are as remote from sensitive jobs as a truckdriver? And how can I reconcile a valid security check with the wild-eyed
306 MCDONALD AVENUE
BROOKLYN 18, N. Y.

Hysteria whipped up by vicious reactionaries and bigots who justify their campaigns of fear and hate by the fact that the government itself is doing almost the same thing. Once the snowball of suspicion and deducing a loathsome guilt free anonymous tips and possibly-malicious denunciations gets started, say, the State Department, it is inevitable that it will roll into something huge and flatten everybody in its path -- be he postal clerk, typist, or elevator operator. The psychology of suspicion and intolerance quickly reaches the point where it invades all walks of life, because we're all afraid of the same thing -- losing the democracy we all cherish so. "Reasonable doubt" turns into "reasonable grounds" for dismissal. What is the difference between "reasonable doubt" of a man's loyalty and "reasonable grounds" for assuming his disloyalty? When you begin to think that way, where do you stop? Is it any wonder that our own Secretary of State and Defense Secretary can be called Communists when intelligent, respectable men can fire a person because of evidence that can never stand up in a court of law?

Yes, I'm really upset about all this. I heard of something today that got me mad. It was of a man I know who is desperate, his family in a terrible way. He was a postoffice clerk, he's 34 years old. He's worked hard and struggled all his life for the security he thought he had in the postoffice. But then he lost his job in a loyalty investigation because it turned out that somebody said that he had been a member of a subversive organization when he was 16 years old. He didn't deny it, it was true. I don't even know what organization it was, but it probably was some Communist-led group that said it wanted to do away with discrimination and prejudice. He's a Negro so he joined it. Why shouldn't he have? Do you ask for a man's credentials when you're sick and he promises to relieve your pain? Now, 18 years later, he loses his job and his family's bread and butter because he is suddenly labeled "a known subversive"?

That's not the end of the story. He found another job -- as a truckdriver. I don't think it paid as well as the one he lost but he couldn't be fussy. Then his firm got a defense contract. He was fired again, same reason. Maybe he'll find another job, maybe he won't for a long while. What is to happen to him, not only economically but morally? Is his family to be disgraced because some narrow-minded group of officials don't have enough sense or decency to know a subversive from a hole in the wall?

It's a nasty story, but I daresay it's not the only one of its kind. I wonder what this man would say of the kind of "Americanism" that gives him freedom of speech.
with one hand and then taken away his very bread and butter for having exercised it in a way that isn't popular any more. What kind of "Americanism" is that grants him the freedom of assembly our Constitution talks of with one hand and then ruins his insignificant career with the other because he exercised it? What harm to national security is there in allowing this man to live and work? Even if he were a Communist, which he isn't and never dreamed of being, how could he sabotage the nation's defense by stealing stamps in a post-office or driving some contractor's dump truck, or whatever kind of truck it is? Isn't our FBI efficient enough to catch a saboteur on evidence without our having to terrorize every person who ever dared to speak up for the equality we know is ours, regardless of skin color? Am I to stop believing that discrimination is bad just because the Communists say the same thing? Is the President the only one who can get away with saying that FSOC-laws are necessary to insure fairness in job selection? That's what it comes down to, it seems to me.

It's reached the point where I have to think more than twice about writing a letter to my own President for fear it'll find its way into some dossier and be thrown back at me someday by God-knows-who. I'm quite serious about that -- I had seriously to tell myself that if we've reached that stage by now, there's no use in having any more faith in anything, so I might just as well take the chance.

And that isn't a healthy attitude for a citizen of a democracy to have. When ordinary people like me begin to think that way, Americanism is truly in danger.

I really hope you'll be able to answer these questions in my mind. I want to know how you feel about those things, so I can understand them better. I guess it all boils down to this -- how can you, as President, accept the responsibility for having started the official loyalty program and attack those who are merely carrying it to its logical extreme (God help us if it gets any more extreme than now)! If these are perhaps unkind words, I hope you'll try to put yourself in my place and know how I felt when I heard about the man I just spoke of. I think none of us can possibly know how he must feel!

Sincerely yours,

Laurence Jaeger
### Using Source 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sourcing Questions</th>
<th>Notice the date on this document. How does this document show the effects of the Loyalty Program?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contextualization Questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corroboration Tasks</td>
<td>In what ways does this document corroborate the concerns expressed in earlier documents? Cite a specific document and specific concerns validated by this document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Reading Questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My dear President Truman:

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People is greatly concerned about an increasing tendency on the part of government agencies to associate activity on interracial matters with disloyalty. Thus, various investigating agents of the government have been asking white persons whether they associate with colored people. Colored people have been asked whether they have entertained white people in their homes. In addition, there is considerable evidence before us that many colored government employees, who are now being charged with disloyalty, have such accusations brought against them because they have actively opposed segregation and discrimination in their places of employment or in their communities.

At present, we have information on charges filed against colored and white government workers in Chicago, New York, St. Louis, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, and Baltimore. If given a fair hearing, these individuals will undoubtedly obtain complete exoneration. Meanwhile, the government will have spent considerable time and money in processing their cases. The evidence against them is such that it should never have been used in the first instance. However, since it was used, the written answers furnished by employees are more than sufficient to justify dismissal of the cases. Under the Loyalty Review Board's regulations, agencies are entitled to drop such charges without hearing. However, in the cases mentioned, the agencies have decided to conduct hearings. This is particularly true of the Post Office Department, which has work records of fifteen years and more are now suddenly charged with disloyalty.
In view of the new developments, we believe that the whole loyalty program should be restudied by a committee of distinguished citizens. The present procedure of confronting employees with charges based on hearsay and doubtful sources has done much to embarrass and intimidate loyal citizens. We, therefore, respectfully urge that a review be made of the present loyalty program. The NAACP is particularly interested in preventing biased informants and officials from using the loyalty program to persecute members of minority groups or persons sympathetic to the program of civil rights, which you have so courageously championed.

Ever sincerely,

[Signature]

Secretary.

The Honorable Harry S. Truman
President of the United States
The White House
Washington, D. C.

ww/mdj
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sourcing Questions</th>
<th>Walter White was executive secretary of the NAACP. Why is his affiliation with that organization important?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Contextualization Questions | Truman is known for some of his early work on civil rights. Why is that significant in understanding this document?  
**NOTE TO teacher:** Perhaps review Truman’s desegregation of the armed forces in 1948. *What is this author’s concern?* |
| Corroboration Tasks |                                                                                                       |
| Close Reading Questions |                                                                                                       |
To the President

AND

The Congress of The United States

PETITION

We, the undersigned citizens and residents of the United States, hereby express our approval of the fight which the United States is waging against Communism, believing that the defeat of this form of totalitarianism is as important to world peace as the defeat of Nazism and Fascism. We pledge our support to the United States Government and its various agencies in fighting Communist infiltration into American life and American institutions in an effort to confront and defeat them in the conflict between this country and the Soviet Union and its satellites. We sincerely believe that the people in Eastern European countries including Slovakia, our ancestral home, are not in favor of Communist rule; that the vast majority of those people are for America and the American form of democracy and are ready and willing to fight with the United States in bringing about lasting peace in Europe and the world, which will never be possible by imposing alien rule upon them even though the most ruthless methods are employed.

NAME          ADDRESS
Katherine Ziemowit
Thelma Pattea
Mary Sedlacek
Johanna Pizem
Bissica Zemen
Johanna Podalska
Rose Jurecso
Mary Spasick
John Lapka
Mary Zemen
Alice Ruddy
Josef Zemen
Emilly Kopeck
Joseph Breyak
Claudia Mika
Maria Vrakocheck
Rose Velenacky
Catherine M. Pugel
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Using Source 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sourcing Questions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contextualization Questions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corroboration Tasks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Close Reading Questions</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Truman’s Loyalty Program: Weighing the Evidence

Framing Question: *Do Cold War fears during the Truman Administration justify the institution of the government Employee Loyalty Program in a democratic society?*

*Directions:* As you read the documents, determine where to place them on the graphic organizer below, based on how the document illustrates that position on the essential question. Be prepared to explain your reasoning. (Indicate specific details from the document that prove the accuracy of your placement on the scales.)