

Red Scares, Political Repression, and Social Work: Why Now?**Leadership*****President***

Stephen Monroe Tomczak, PhD, LMSW
Associate Professor and Assistant Chair
Department of Social Work
Southern Connecticut State University
tomczaks1@southernct.edu

Vice President

Jessica Toft, PhD, MSW, LISW
Associate Professor
School of Social Work
University of Minnesota
jtoft@umn.edu

Secretary

Justin S. Harty, MSW, LCSW
Assistant Professor
School of Social Work
Arizona State University
justinharty@asu.edu

Advisor

Mimi Abramovitz, DSW, MSW
Bertha Capen Reynolds Professor of
Social Welfare Policy
Silberman School of Social Work
Hunter College
iabramov@hunter.cuny.edu

Bibliography Editors***Lead Editors***

Mimi Abramovitz
Jessica Toft
Kit Ginzky, MA
Doctoral Candidate
Crown Family School of Social
Work and Department of History
University of Chicago
kgindler@uchicago.edu

Support Editors

Stephen Monroe Tomczak
Justin S. Harty

Archival Support

Linnea M. Anderson
Archivist
University of Minnesota
Social Welfare History Archives
ande3748@umn.edu

Links***Join***

tomczaks1@southernct.edu

Website

southernct.edu/swwhg

Collection

worldcat.org/oclc/609423471

Twitter

@SWHG1956

From the Editors

What is a Red Scare? “Red Scares” describe the times in US history when a group or the government itself, seeking to uphold the class, race, and gendered status quo, publicly identifies and undermines their political opponents (often without evidence) by calling them communists, socialists, anarchists, or subversives and accusing them of disloyalty to the United States. The term *red scare* comes from the historic connection of the color *red* with communism.¹

When and Why Did Red Scares Occur? The first Red Scare (1919-29) followed activism and calls for systemic change in the US sparked by the 1917 Russian Revolution. In the aftermath of the Great Depression, during the New Deal period (1933-39), communist and socialist ideas enjoyed a popularity that ushered in the expansion of the welfare state and the rise of trade unionism, and the emergence of influential and militant pro-labor, anti-racist, and feminist consumer movements (Storrs, 2006). The backlash against these movements and progressive changes generated anti-communist momentum that laid the groundwork for the “Second Red Scare,” also referred to as McCarthyism (1947-57) (Vocabulary.org, 2022). The conjunction of sit-down strikers demanding higher wages and housewives demanding lower prices and higher quality products alarmed American conservatives who charged government workers, Hollywood artists, labor leaders, teachers, social workers, consumers, and civil rights leaders as communists or “fellow travelers.” In the eyes of their critics, the accused’s support for social change, social planning, a larger role for government in the US, as well as justice for Black people and women, posed a challenge to the power of the prevailing political and corporate elite that needed to be stopped. The Red Scare crusaders typically raised the specter of communism to discredit the challenge and to justify the ensuing political repression (Goldstein, 2014). The key federal agencies and Congressional committees that sensationalized Red Scare fears and managed the repression included the well-known Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) (1908 to present), a network of “patriotic” organizations (1920s), the Special House Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities (1938-1945), the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) (1945 -1957), and Senate Internal Security Subcommittee (SISS) (1955-1971). The Second Red Scare *actively* fueled the Cold War (1947-1991).

Taken together, the American red scares point to an evolving political landscape rather than isolated bouts of anti-communist hysteria that exploded onto—and then vanished—from the political scene (Goldstein 2014). The repeated pattern suggests that throughout the 20th century, powerful interests in government and business mobilized unfounded fears of an internal Communist enemy to silence, discredit, or stamp out activist individuals and progressive political organizations whose ideas, actions, and policies challenged systemic racism and sexism, capitalism, militarism, and colonialism (Wolfe-Rocca, 2022). In each red scare, fear of the charges of subversion spread through American politics, culture, and wider society. Thousands of ordinary people lost their jobs, suffered organized violence, deportation, or prison, and/or lost family, marriages, friends, and other important personal relationships. The resulting climate of fear, suspicion, and restrictions on civil liberties intentionally chilled discussions of

progressive ideas and otherwise narrowed the scope of political discourse. Under the guise of protecting democracy by eliminating so-called threats to the American way of life, red scares have historically undermined democracy, stifled progressive social policy, and infringed on constitutional rights to freedom of speech, expression, and association. As this bibliography shows, red scares did not exempt social workers. Nor have we seen the last one.

Panics over progressive political ideas and critiques of the status quo continue to generate backlash and repression in the United States. In addition to charges of communism and socialism, today's fear tactics include expanded terminology designed to undermine the institutions of democracy and to stifle dissent against the rise of authoritarianism. Charges of "terrorism" (American Civil Liberties Union, 2022), laid the groundwork for an aggressive infringement of first amendment rights followed by a rising attack on the nation's democratic institutions. Supporters of voter suppression and election subversion actively disenfranchised voters. Charges of "fake news" discredited the press to quell dissent. The belief in a "deep state," the January 6th 2021 attack on the US Capitol, and repeated calls to "Stop the Steal," mobilized mounting distrust of the government. Contemporary panics targeting critical race theory, feminism, and queer theory as forms of "wokeness" delegitimized critiques of white supremacy and patriarchy, fueled banning books and justified dictating what can and cannot be borrowed from the library and taught in the classroom. To stoke fears of a multiracial democracy, political opponents attacked progressive women of color elected to the US House of Representatives² as communists or socialists and questioned their citizenship status. The loss of voting rights, reproductive freedom, and gun safety rules paved the way for dismantling still other basic constitutional rights, possibly affirmative action, same sex marriage, and disability rights among others on the Supreme Court docket at this time. While the outcome of the 2022 midterm election could have resulted in sending many election deniers to office, red scare tactics may well continue to justify an ongoing attack on democratic institutions through 2023 and beyond.

Why Now? With this bibliography, the Social Welfare History Group asks if these charges and trends carried out in the name of national security, election "integrity," and the restoration of the "American way of life" qualify as a modern-day red scare. We hope this Red Scare bibliography will help social workers grapple with this question. If the past becomes prologue, we ignore contemporary threats to democracy at our own risk!

– Mimi Abramovitz, Jessica Toft, and Kit Ginzky

Notes

¹Although Red Scare predated and outlasted Senator Joseph McCarthy (WI), the term McCarthyism became the label for the tactic of undermining political opponents by making unsubstantiated attacks on their loyalty to the United States
<https://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/red%20scare>

²The targeting in the media of Democratic Representatives Ayanna Pressley, Ilhan Omar, Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, Rashida Tlaib, and Cori Bush, all progressive women of color, illustrates that the "red" aspect of political repression is still alive; Bush, Omar, Ocasio-Cortez, and Tlaib are dues-paying members of the Democratic Socialists of America. In 2021, Rep. Marjorie Taylor Greene called Ocasio-Cortez a "little communist" and called for her to be incarcerated. President Trump repeatedly accused Ilhan Omar, a Somali refugee and one of the first Muslim women to serve in Congress, of being a terrorist supporter while questioning her citizenship status. <https://www.salon.com/2021/06/29/alexandria-ocasio-cortez-has-had-enough-of-marjorie-taylor-greenes-trolling-im-taller-than-her/>; <https://www.factcheck.org/2019/07/trumps-false-claims-about-rep-ilhan-omar/>

References

American Civil Liberties Union (2022). Surveillance under the USA/Patriot Act. <https://www.aclu.org/other/surveillance-under-usapatriot-act>

Goldstein, R. J. (2014). *Little 'Red Scares': Anti-communism and political repression in the United States, 1921-1946*. Routledge.

Lieberman, R., & Lang, C. (2009). *Anticommunism and the African American freedom movement: Another side of the story*. Palgrave MacMillan.

Storrs, L. (2006). Left-feminism, the consumer movement, and red scare politics in the United States, 1935–1960. *Journal of Women's History*, 18(3), 40–67.

Wolfe-Rocca, U. (2022). Subversives: Stories from the Red Scare. Zinn Education Project.
<https://www.zinnedproject.org/materials/subversives-stories-from-the-red-scare/>

Vocabulary.org (2022). Red Scare. <https://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/red%20scare>

Submission Acknowledgments

The Social Welfare History Group would like to thank the following people who have submitted additional references included in this bibliography:

- *Jacob Otis, PhD Candidate, School of Social Work, University of Minnesota,*

Reference Submissions

We invite reference submissions to this bibliography for inclusion in future versions. Please send your reference submission to the lead editor for this bibliography, Dr Mimi Abramovitz (iabramov@hunter.cuny.edu).

Forthcoming Bibliographies

#103: Legacy Series: Black Contributions to Mutual Aid, Social Welfare, and Social Work History

- Lead Editor: Justin S. Harty

#104: Legacy Series: Indigenous Contributions to Mutual Aid, Social Welfare, and Social Work History

- Lead Editors: Autumn Asher BlackDeer & Justin S. Harty

Social Welfare History Group: Bibliography of Scholarship in Social Welfare History
Red Scares, Political Repression, and Social Work: Why Now?

Contents

Readings on Red Scares 3

The First Red Scare (WWI, 1917-1929)..... 4

Readings on the Societal Context of the First Red Scare 6

Primary Sources and More on the Impact of First Red Scare on Social Work..... 7

Red Scare Interregnum? The Great Depression and New Deal Period (1930-1945)..... 10

Readings on the Societal Context for the Red Scare Interregnum 11

Primary Sources and More on the Impact of the Red Scare Interregnum on Social Work..... 12

The Second Red Scare (or “McCarthyism”): 1945-1957 15

Readings on the Societal Context of the Second Red Scare 17

Primary Sources and More on Impact of Second Red Scare on Social Work 19

Archival Collections: Primary Sources regarding Red Scares 22

Recommended Citation..... 24

Readings on Red Scares

Milliband, R., & Liebman, M. (1984). Reflections on anti-communism. *The Socialist Register*, 21(1), 1-22.

Abstract: Ever since the Bolshevik Revolution of October 1917, anti-communism has been a dominant theme in the political warfare waged by conservative forces against the entire left, both Communist and non-Communist. Since 1945, and the onset of the Cold War, in particular, a massive propaganda and indoctrination enterprise deployed a multitude of different sources and means (i.e., newspapers, radio, television, films, articles, pamphlets, books, speeches, sermons, official documents) to disseminate anti-communism. No other subject has received the volume of criticism and denunciation. At no time since 1917 has anti-communism failed to occupy a major, even a central, place in the politics and policies of the capitalist world. Its intensity and form varied from country to country and from period to period. However, among capitalist democracies US anti-communism became especially virulent and pervasive. The attack focused on different Communist countries at various times: China during the Korean War and Vietnam during the Vietnam War. But the Soviet Union has always been viewed as the principal and most dangerous enemy. This article focuses on anti-communism directed to the Soviet Union.

Reisch, M., & Andrews, J. (2001). *The road not taken: A history of radical social work in the United States*. Brunner-Routledge.

Abstract: *The Road Not Taken* takes a new perspective on the course of social welfare policy in the twentieth century. This examination looks at the evolution of social work in the United States as a dynamic process not just driven by mainstream organizations and politics, but also strongly influenced by the ideas and experiences of radical individuals and marginalized groups.

Ryan, E. (2020). Women, gender, and red scares in the modern United States. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of American History*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199329175.013.579>

Summary: Both The first Red Scare, after World War I, and the Red Scare that followed World War II, affected American women. In both 1919 and 1940, they found their lives hemmed in by antifeminism and the conservative gender ideology that underwrote anti-communist thinking. This cultural nationalism tied traditional gender norms to the defense of American values and ideals. It positioned the family as a bulwark against communism while making women's performance of gender roles symbolic of national health or sickness. Within this gendered nationalism, the first Red Scare offered opportunities for conservative women to join the antiradical causes as protectors of the home while maligning radical and progressive women for their feminism and their social activism. Likewise, for the second Red Scare in the 1940s, anticommunism provided a safe platform for conservative women to engage in political activism in defense of the family, and in turn, they participated in broader efforts that attacked and weakened civil rights claims and the social justice efforts of women on the left. In each Red Scare, the symbols and rhetoric of anticommunism prioritized women's relationship to the family, positioning them either as bastions of American virtue or as fundamental threats to the social and political order. Gender proved critical to the construction of patriotism and national identity.

The First Red Scare (WWI, 1917-1929)

During the Progressive Era (1890-1917) organized labor and social reformers gained ground politically, economically, and culturally. Labor union membership grew eightfold from 1900 to over four million by 1919. Workers won significant concessions from corporations including improved wages and working conditions (Murray, 1955). In addition, social reformers—including many settlement house social workers—participated in or led voluntary associations that successfully fought for public funding to support parenting, child welfare, public health, and other cultural and social services. Excluded from white institutions, Black social workers, reformers, club women, and the community at-large built parallel support systems for Blacks improving working and living conditions (Carlton-LaNey, 1999; Lasch-Quinn, 1993). Simultaneously, the Bolshevik uprising in Russia (1917) instituted the first socialist government, instilling fear among capitalist leaders worldwide (Franz, 2018). Combined, these welfare state and workforce gains threatened the prevailing social order that protected and promoted the interests of capitalists and those who had fared best under this system: whites, men, Christians, US-born citizens, and corporations. To quell this progress, the US government and big business joined forces to uphold the status quo. Among other things, they rallied local vigilance groups to rid the country of communist agitators in what became known as the First Red Scare (Fischer, 2016; Franz, 2018; Hodges, 2019).

As part of the First Red Scare, US government drew on both new and longstanding federal laws such as the Enemy Alien Act (1800), the Espionage Act (1917), the Immigrant and Anarchist Exclusion Act (1903), and the State Criminal Syndicalism statutes (first in 1917), as well as other tactics associated with colonial rule and worker suppression. The US Army established the Military Intelligence Division and the Department of Justice advanced its Bureau of Intelligence reconnaissance (Fischer, 2016). Legislators, high-level bureaucrats, and the military cooperated to suppress government critiques, surveil the public, censor telecommunications, mail, and media, and deport immigrants, often by executive order. They strove to limit what social work faculty could teach and promoted loyalty oaths in order for teachers to be licensed. While remaining silent, the courts permitted arrests without warrants, preliminary hearings without counsel, and/or severe delay in appointing counsel (Preston, 1994).

Simultaneously, big business and the pro-war government strove, in particular, to destabilize the mounting trade union movement which they contended would lead to domestic revolution. They especially feared the radical, but powerful, Industrial Workers of the World (IWW) whose call for one giant union of unskilled workers encompassing all races,

sexes, immigrants, and migrants challenged the power of big business. Emboldened by the public's acceptance of this anti-labor narrative, businesses employed their own private "police forces." They deployed local police, state militias, and the National Guard to quash strikes and to silence most other forms of dissent (Katz, 1996). Wilson's call to war in 1917 rallied vigilance groups—a local control tool used to maintain social order since colonial times (Capozzola, 2002). The citizen policing, anti-labor, moral, and racial vigilance groups targeted "pacifists, suffragists, ethnic minorities, religious fundamentalists, trade unionists, and socialists" (Capozzola, 2002, p.1361). Acting as a pseudo-arm of the government, they quelled labor strikes and pacifist protests, ravaged communities of color, and silenced dissenting political views (Capozzola, 2002; Fischer, 2016; Peterson & Fite, 1957).

Wilson and his cabinet also formed the Committee on Public Information (1917-1919) to craft military propaganda. Media, government, and military leaders collaborated to galvanize a nationalist message to argue that the US needed to fight a war abroad to protect democracy at home (Vaughn, 1980). The President also warned of a domestic war of sorts: immigrants were portrayed as "enemy aliens" and "hyphenated Americans." The above-noted vigilance groups helped to spread this military propaganda nationwide. Political dissent was considered unpatriotic. Ostensibly formed to identify spies, in practice vigilance groups, like the 85,000-member National Security League—an American "patriotic" and nationalistic organization—also operated to keep people in line.

In important ways, settlement houses cooperated with the anti-immigrant campaign by "Americanizing" new immigrants. Their English language and citizenship classes and discussion clubs sought to assimilate new immigrants to subscribe to the country's white, educated, middle-class expectations (Davis, 1994). Just before World War I, and much more intentionally, Frances Kellor, Hull-House alum and leader of the Americanization movement, wrote *Straight America* (i.e., "one" America). In it, she openly stated, ". . . [W]e do not all speak the same language nor follow the same flag. . . . America has neglected, even forgotten its task of making Americans of the people who have come to its shores. . . . but the final question for this nation to answer is - are they loyal American citizens?" (Kellor, 1916, p.5). While Kellor later disavowed harsh tactics (Murdach, 2008), such narratives legitimized state and citizen group scrutiny of immigrants and persons perceived as countering "American" norms. Despite their Americanization programs, but perhaps because of their support for trade unions and demilitarization, following WWI, the government targeted settlements and social workers. The New York Joint Legislative Committee to Investigate Seditious Activities (aka the "Lusk Committee," led by Senator Clayton R. Lusk), investigated settlement houses, social workers, and schools of social work as promoters of Bolshevism/Communism. *The New York Times* covered the raids and investigations of the Lusk Committee sympathetically. In response, social workers and social reformers resisted such portrayals by writing editorials and journal articles, speech-making, and engaging legal counsel.

After the dissolution of the Lusk Committee in 1921, the state and vigilance groups continued to fan suspicion through propaganda. For example, in 1923, a military librarian drafted the infamous Spider Web Chart. The single-page document diagrammed supposed links among many civil society associations, especially those involving highly active women's social reform organizations. It labeled their leaders as radical, unfeminine, and Un-American (Nielsen, 2001). The list included social work leaders and participants in such groups as the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, National Consumers League, Women's Trade Union League, National Congress of Mothers, League of Women Voters, Women's Christian Temperance Union, National American Women's Suffrage Association, Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA), and more. The Spider Web Chart both identified "communist" domestic enemies and silenced challenges to the ideas that upheld the dominant social order. "Built on slanderous assertions, gross simplifications, stereotypes, and paranoid fantasies. . . [this political propaganda] . . . gave anticommunists a *raison d'être*" (Fischer, 2016, p.72). Very succinct and readily understandable, the chart refuted almost any need for justification and explanation (Fischer, 2016).

By the end of the First Red Scare, an extensive playbook for political repression existed. It included the coordination of anti-communist drives by the state, business, and military/police; the application of old or colonial-based laws to current domestic arenas; the collusion of courts; the deployment of police forces to ensure policy adherence; the installment of government surveillance and censorship capabilities to limit opposing political views; the enactment of legislation to constrain what could be taught in all levels of education; the partnership of state with local vigilance groups to ensure social order; the development of government persuasive briefs to shape public discourse; and the persecution by state and

local officials of outgroups involving raids, investigations, and public hearings. They left a well-developed blueprint readily used by leaders of future red scares for their own anti-communist campaigns.

References

- Capozzola, C. (2002). The only badge needed is your patriotic fervor: Vigilance, coercion, and the law in World War I America. *The Journal of American History*, 88(4), 1354-1382.
- Carlton-LaNey, I. (1999). African American social work pioneers' response to need. *Social Work*, 44(4), 311-321.
- Fischer, N. (2016). *The spider web: The birth of American anticommunism*. University of Illinois Press.
- Franz, M. (2018). Preparedness revisited: Civilian societies and the campaign for American defense, 1914-1920. *The Journal of the Gilded Age and the Progressive Era*, 17(4), 663-676.
- Hodges, A.J. (2019). Introduction: Reassessing the Red Scare of 1919-20 at its centennial. *The Journal of the Gilded Age and the Progressive Era*, 18(1), 3-6.
- Lasch-Quinn, E. (1993). *Black neighbors: Race and limits of reform in the American settlement house movement, 1895-1945*. The University of North Carolina Press.
- Katz, M. (1996). *In the shadow of the poorhouse: A social history of welfare in America*. Basic Books.
- Kellor, F. (1916). *Straight America: A call to national service*. Macmillan.
- Murdach, A.D. (2008). Frances Kellor and the Americanization movement. *Social Work*, 53(1), 93-95.
- Murray, R.K. (1955). *Red scare: A study in national hysteria, 1919-1920*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Nielsen, K.E. (2001). *Un-American womanhood: Antiradicalism, antifeminism, and the first red scare*. The Ohio State University Press.
- Peterson, H.C. & Fite, G.C. (1957). *Opponents of war, 1917-1918*, University of Washington Press.
- Preston, W. (1994). *Aliens and dissenters: Federal suppression of radicals, 1903-1933*. Harvard University Press.
- Vaughn, S. (1980). *Holding fast the inner lines: Democracy, nationalism, and the Committee on Public Information*. University of North Carolina Press.

Readings on the Societal Context of the First Red Scare

Trolander, J.A. (1975). Boards, chests, and funds (Ch. 3, pp.50-63). *Settlement houses and the Great Depression*. Wayne State University Press.

Summary: Community chests and board members wielded power over the political and social activism of the settlement houses, especially actions regarded as communist or socialist. For example, after the Board removed Miss Ratzlaff from Hiram House staff, board president, Fleury Prentiss, wrote to the head worker, "I have very little patience with a radical of the type of Miss Ratzlaff or her sympathizers ... they don't change their inner and at times outward feelings toward the governing class, ... hence I have nothing to do with them and let them flock by themselves or adjourn to some country, such as Russia or preferably an island ..." (p. 56). In general, the control of their budget by community chests led the settlements to focus on recreational and institutional work, rather than on political and social action that would alter living conditions. The financially independent settlements, such as Hull-House or those supported by the deficit fund that supported a small percentage of social agencies but with less oversight, could function more independently.

Fischer, N. (2016). The Spider Web Chart (Chapter 4, pp.71-79). *Spider Web: The birth of American Anti-Communism*. University of Illinois Press.

Summary: During World War I the military developed new warfare strategies from chemical weapons to intelligence services that they wanted to protect and employ. However, following the 1918 Armistice, progressive women and pacifist groups successfully reduced military funding. To reverse these gains the military, along with "representatives of the government, big business, [and] high finance ..." (p.71), led the first Red Scare. Under the direction of Colonel Friesl, head of World War I chemical warfare department, a military librarian created The Spider Web Chart that presented a network of individuals and groups in a single-page illustration of purported Bolsheviks, communists, and sympathizers. According to the chart, the major organs of socialist and communist propaganda included the Women's Joint Congressional Committee and The National Council for the Prevention of War. The chart drew lines from these two groups to many others mostly women's organizations including The National League of Women Voters, The General Federation of Women's Clubs, The Women's Christian Temperance Union, the National Congress of Mothers, National Women's Trade Union, National Council of Jewish Women, Young Women's Christian Association, and the Girls' Friendly Society. In an extended

1926 chart, they also called out well-known economic and peacekeeping activists including social workers such as Jane Addams. The chart "proved to be a scheme of unique power, ideal for spreading the message of anticommunism" (p. 72). It also forged enduring alliances among groups who would continue to pick up the "anticommunist" mantle in subsequent red scares.

Hodges, A. (2019). The First Red Scare. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of American History*.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199329175.013.555>.

From the Summary: The First Red Scare, which occurred in 1919–1920, emerged out of longer clashes in the United States over the processes of industrialization, immigration, and urbanization as well as escalating conflict over the development of a labor movement challenging elite control of the economy. More immediately, the suppression of dissent during World War I and shock over a revolution in Russia that energized anti-capitalist radicals spurred further confrontations during an ill-planned postwar demobilization of the armed forces and economy.

Preston, W. (1994). *Aliens and dissenters: Federal suppression of radicals, 1903-1933*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

From the first chapter: The Immigration Bureau brought to the deportation of radicals the same abusive tactics used in the apprehension and removal of all "aliens." Contemporary observers were aware of the excessive and devious violations of fundamental rights. The roundup of many innocent people, detentions incommunicado, excessive bail, and denial of counsel until confessions had been extorted were not the product of an unusual nationwide postwar hysteria that denied due process to "reds"; the processing of aliens had been growing more and more summary for years. Yet many of the procedures had remained unchallenged, the powers untested, until they were exposed to public scrutiny during the red scare and fully debated for perhaps the first and last time in immigration history. . . . Deportation was not a punishment for crime, but merely an administrative process for the return of unwelcome and undesirable alien residents to their own countries. . . . Once deportation had been defined as noncriminal, all else followed. The guarantees of the Bill of Rights applied only to persons charged with a crime. Expulsion often involved, therefore, long detention, excessively high bail, unreasonable searches and seizures, the denial of counsel, self-incrimination, and trial without jury.

Primary Sources and More on the Impact of First Red Scare on Social Work

The Survey (1919, April 26). Making America sound. *The Survey*, 42, 148-149. Social Welfare History Archives, University of Minnesota.

Summary: Describes as an example of democracy the debates held by the City Club of Cleveland in various neighborhood community centers. The discussions that addressed divisive political and economic topics represented a counter to communities that focus narrowly on fighting Bolshevism.

New York Times (1919, June 25). Sees propaganda in settlement houses: Secretary of Evangelistic Committee asks Lusk body to include them in inquiry. Senator justifies raids: I.W.W. shuns courts—Hugh Frayne to tell more of radical efforts among union labor, 12.

https://timesmachine.nytimes.com/timesmachine/1919/06/25/96321654.pdf?pdf_redirect=true&ip=0

First two paragraphs: The legislative committee investigating seditious propaganda has been asked to make a thorough investigation of the college settlements which are operating in the poorer part of the city. The formal demand was made to Attorney General Charles D. Newton, counsel for the committee, by Charles A. Starr Secretary of the Evangelistic Committee, and interdenominational body. Mr. Starr told the Attorney General that in his opinion the committee should seek light on the question of whether these settlements, maintained by voluntary contributions, do not use the funds contrary to the expectations of many of the donors, for the purpose of teaching radical and un-American doctrines to those who come to these institutions for guidance.

United Neighborhood Houses of New York City (1919, June 25). [Minutes of Executive Committee Meeting]. (United Neighborhood Houses of NYC, Box 239, Folder 6). Social Welfare History Archives, University of Minnesota.

Summary: In 1919 the New York State Legislature formed the Joint Legislative Committee to Investigate Seditious Activities, popularly known as the Lusk Committee, to investigate individuals and organizations suspected of sedition in the operation of settlement houses. The Executive Committee of the United Neighborhood Houses of NYC held an emergency meeting in response to the *New York Times* article calling on the Lusk Committee to investigate all settlement houses for “teaching un-American ideas, radicalism and using funds to breed Bolsheviks” (p.1). The Executive committee voted to have an independent journalist follow the work of the United Neighborhood Houses of NYC to teach the public what they were doing; drafted an editorial to be published the following day that countered the claims of the article and challenged the Lusk Committee’s methods; elected a member, Harold Riegler, as counsel for the United Neighborhood Houses to represent the settlements in relation to any Lusk committee investigation. They also generated names of prominent supportive donors to write their own editorials painting settlements in a positive light.

United Neighborhood Houses of New York City (1919, July 8). [Minutes of Executive Committee Meeting]. (United Neighborhood Houses of NYC, Box 239, Folder 6). Social Welfare History Archives, University of Minnesota.

Summary: During a routine Executive Committee Meeting, the committee approved a new publicity agent based on the recommendations during the emergency executive committee meeting. In addition to routine reports, the committee discussed whether the United Neighborhood Houses should participate in the Community Council financial drive or not. The committee also discussed how the United Neighborhood Houses should address the issue of Bolshevism. They established a committee to “define settlement attitudes on leading current and economic problems of the day” (p.4) to be approved by each settlement.

New York Times (1919, July 8). Settlement head denies propaganda: Mrs. Mary R. Simkhovitch declares no anti-government doctrines are taught: Radical views discussed: Greenwich House Director says, however, that nothing seditious is permitted, 7. <https://www.nytimes.com/1919/07/20/archives/settlement-head-denies-propaganda-mrs-mary-r-simkhovitch-declares.html>

Summary: Mary Simkhovitch, head resident of the Greenwich House of the New York United Neighborhood Houses, responds to Lusk Committee accusations that Bolshevik views were spread throughout NYC settlement houses. She explained that the settlements do not allow propaganda, that committees develop educational topics to notify settlement house boards, and that most discussions take the form of debates to encourage the expression of many views. Simkhovitch adds that the working class is not interested in Bolshevism, but rather prefers a “legal and orderly process” to change the conditions of inflation and poor wages. Settlement houses offer a venue for such change through “genuine Americanism” involving participation in and receipt of social and civic services. Settlements have also been the “headquarters” helping the government to support people during the war including, “Liberty Loan, Food Administration, Fuel Administration, Red Cross, War Risk Insurance, Children’s Year, etc.” Settlements develop and support democracy. They should not be stifled in their ability to do so.

The Survey (1919, July 19). The Lusk Committee. *The Survey*, 42, 602. Social Welfare History Archives, University of Minnesota.

Summary: Describes Lusk Committee searches of various organizations including the Russian Soviet Bureau, the Rand School, the Left Wing Socialists, and the I.W.W. The legal counsel obtained by the Rand School sent a letter to Senator Lusk demanding that the committee hold its meetings in public, that certain people should have the opportunity to testify before the committee, and that they desist from using any of the documents they obtained. References Simkhovitch’s interview in which she maintains settlement houses (seen as a seedbed of Bolshevism by the Lusk Committee) are rather a place to foster “American traditions, ideals, and modes of life.” Reports that the Lusk Committee plans to continue its search for “seditious” activities in other cities.

Devine, E.T. (1919, December 27). To the President. *The Survey*, 43, 305. Social Welfare History Archives, University of Minnesota. Link to December 27, 1919 issue

Summary: Edward T. Devine, the Director of the New York School of Philanthropy (1904-1907; 1912-1917) and long-term general secretary for the New York Charity Organization Society vehemently argues against the idea that discontent in America should be forcibly eradicated. "The idea that radical agitation is to be 'stamped out' by imprisonments, deportations, raids and the denial of the constitutional rights of assembly and discussion, is ridiculous." Rather, President Wilson and all elected officials should offer people the chance to express their grievances through the free press and other outlets. He maintains that the current suppression of dissent is the true danger to democracy.

Calghorn, K.H. (1920, January 17). Aliens and sedition in the New Year. *Survey*, 43, 422-423. Social Welfare History Archives, University of Minnesota. Link to January 17, 1920 issue.

Summary: Despite its victory in WWI, the U.S. Congress treated all foreigners as "agitators or revolutionists." It drafted bills to limit their entry into the country or speed their deportation. Congress proposed an amendment to the restrictive immigration law of 1917 that would expand restrictions related to political comments. Challenges to the "industrial order" provoked similar proposals. This is a critical comparative policy analysis of state laws and repressive typologies by region including the imposition of severe and broad penalties for any critique of the government.

The Survey (1920, January 24). Negro "sedition." *Survey*, 43, 448. Social Welfare History Archives, University of Minnesota. Link to January 24, 1920 issue

Summary: James Weldon Johnson, the field secretary of The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) protests the Justice Department's characterization of Black people as "advising anarchy, sedition, and the forcible overthrow of the government." The NAACP publications that included Bolshevist ideas, represented a response to the government's brutalization and political repression of Blacks. The articles promote law enforcement (protection of civil rights), not law evasion.

The Survey (1920, March, 27). Schools à la Rusk. *The Survey*, 43, 799. Social Welfare History Archives, University of Minnesota.

Summary: Lusk Committee proposed to the New York Legislature that University Boards of Regents censor schools of social work and labor unions that teach what it deemed "seditious activities." Porter E. Lee a social work leader, opposed measures that censure educational activities. The Lusk committee also proposed requiring a loyalty test before teachers are licensed and establishing a permanent office of investigation in the attorney general's office. Identifies several repressive methods of the Lusk Committee.

New York Times (1920, March 28). Social workers protest. Say Lusk Committee bill would check activities. Editorial Section, page E. https://timesmachine.nytimes.com/timesmachine/1920/03/28/118314557.pdf?pdf_redirect=true&ip=0

Summary: United Neighborhood Houses in New York City (comprised of 45 settlements) opposed [the Lusk Committee bill]. They said they would testify against it at the state legislative committee. Opponents of the bill said its intent was to monitor the work of settlements engaged in the "Americanization work of foreign-born."

New York Times (1921, May 15). Settlement work criticized by Lusk: Legislative committee finds revolutionary ideas in United Neighborhood Houses: Sees radicalism in clergy: Presbyterians blamed for supporting labor temple—Dr. Grant's church is censured, 7.

First two paragraphs: Settlement houses in this city are denounced as centres of revolutionary teaching in the report of the Lusk Committee which has just been made public. The committee spent more than two years

investigating seditious and radical propaganda and activities in this State and in this report, almost 5,000 pages in length, deals extensively with various phases of such manifestations and the remedies. Much of so-called Americanization and educational work conducted by churches is also condemned as ineffective or pernicious by the committee. According to the report, there is, "and ever-growing tendency toward radicalism in the clergy."

Rowell, C.H. (1927). The challenge to democracy. *Proceedings of the Conference of Charities and Corrections*, 13-19.

Summary: Discusses the *opposite* of political repression, urges social workers, in their unique position, to engage the public in discussions of democracy. Rather than communism, it points towards fascism as the key danger to the nation. Notes that business often favors governments (such as fascist ones) that promote "efficiency."

Selmi, P. (2001). Social work and the campaign to save Sacco and Vanzetti. *Social Service Review*, 75(1), 115-134.

Summary: Examines social work's efforts to save Sacco and Vanzetti [Italian immigrant anarchists controversially convicted of murdering a guard and a paymaster during the April 15, 1920, armed robbery of the Slater and Morrill Shoe Company in Braintree, Massachusetts]. Social work reformers, including Jane Addams and Alice Hamilton, contributed to the campaign. The eventual execution of the prisoners signaled a painful blow to progressive ideals in American society. Red scare practices and broad social changes played decisive roles in the campaign and are more generally relevant for understanding social work in the 1920s and beyond.

Kelley, F. (1986). *Notes of sixty years: The autobiography of Florence Kelley; with an early essay by the author on the need of theoretical preparation for philanthropic work* (K.K. Sklar, Ed.). Charles H. Kerr Press.

Summary: Kelley's memoir, written in the mid-'20s regarding her time as an early resident of Hull-House and the Henry Street Settlement, discusses the intense attack she endured for her socialist commitments. In her introductory essay, Kathryn Kish Sklar directs attention to social workers and settlement workers who were under attack for being "red."

Red Scare Interregnum? The Great Depression and New Deal Period (1930-1945)

The Great Depression and the New Deal are remembered as a high-water mark for the organized left in America. The unprecedented crisis widened the horizon of possibility and made traditional "limited government" ideology less attractive. As the economic crisis ravaged working people, members of the Communist Party (CPUSA) and "fellow travelers" organized and agitated for the federal government to take responsibility for social welfare in an unprecedented way. Pressed by labor unions and the Socialist and Communist-led Unemployed Councils, Congress, supported by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, created a host of New Deal agencies. They included the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, Civilian Conservation Corps, and Works Progress Administration. Congress also enacted Social Security and Fair Labor Standards legislation. Aligned with the New Deal, The Communist Party at this time also adopted the "Popular Front" strategy which deliberately utilized more mainstream rhetoric and coalition work to win reforms. Threatened by capitalist, populist, or right-wing bids for power, including the eventual rise of Fascism in Europe, the Popular Front also fought to preserve Democracy. Many saw the acceptance of the New Deal policies and programs favored by the Left as a compromise needed to "save capitalism from itself," that is, to forestall even more radical reforms.

The New Deal maintained broad public support and the public elected Roosevelt to an unprecedented third term. Meanwhile, New Deal political opponents labeled virtually every New Deal program "socialist." Likewise, the state mobilized its anti-communist repressive apparatus. In the lead-up to World War II and throughout the war, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) intensified its surveillance of suspected fascist and communist activities within the United States and used this intelligence to justify the formation of Congress's Special Committee on Un-American Activities (1938-1944). Known as the Dies Committee, it investigated "Un-American" activities and set the precedent for "naming names," the practice that became a hallmark of McCarthy Era repression. The Dies Committee investigated a number of public and private organizations suspected of being controlled by "reds" including the Federal Theater Project, the Civilian

Conservation Corps, and the American Civil Liberties Union and laid the groundwork for the internment of Japanese Americans. Similar bodies were organized at the state level to investigate state-employed relief workers.

The crises and contradictions of this period brought social work to a crossroads. In this era of labor militancy and political action, how should social workers relate to the rise of the welfare state, the working class, and the labor movement? On the one hand, social work's professional leaders emphasized the importance of working within the Roosevelt Administration to pass reforms rather than agitating from the grassroots (Wandersee, 1993). Prominent social workers in the administration included Harry Hopkins, Frances Perkins, Grace Abbott, Paul Kellogg, and Henry Morgenthau Jr. The social workers who headed federal agencies hired and trained professional but also "untrained" social workers (Ehrenreich, 1985) many of whom were already committed to the labor movement and the organized left. From 1935-1937, several thousand social workers joined the Rank and File Movement, which urged social workers to "relate themselves to industrial workers" by organizing trade unions and agitating alongside Unemployed Councils and other groups for the expansion of government welfare programs (van Kleeck, 1935). Though the Rank and File movement drew its support from legions of workers at the front lines of relief and service provision, it also counted social work academics such as Bertha Capen Reynolds and Mary van Kleeck among its supporters. The movement connected social workers and union activists across the country through its "discussion clubs" and its journal, *Social Work Today*, edited by Jacob Fisher.

Concerned that identification with industrial workers and trade unionism would dash social work's professional aspirations, many social work leaders sought to discredit the Rank and File Movement and assert professional leadership. Opponents both in and outside of social work claimed that the movement was "controlled by the Communist Party," signaling the forms of attacks that would intensify and formalize in the subsequent McCarthy Era (Hunter, 1999). As Dewitt Gilpin, a relief worker at the Kansas City Men's Bureau, noted in his 1935 article for *Social Work Today*, "Rank and file members were accused of being disloyal to the agency, of being 'reds' and disgruntled, inefficient workers." Indeed, Jacob Fisher, acknowledged that the CPUSA played a not insignificant role in the movement:

The rank and file were often close to the party. Many of us were members or closely associated with its organizations. We read the *Daily Worker* and were keenly interested in what they had to say. The editorial positions of *Social Work Today* certainly could be said to sometimes "mirror" the party's lines, but to say we were "dominated" by the party would be simply incorrect. We were as a whole an independent movement and journal, often in agreement with the party and sometimes opposing its positions. The party was certainly powerful in the various public relief unions, and in fact, consolidated their control in the CIO through their assuming leadership in key national positions. But for the most part, the rank-and-file members were interested in bread-and-butter issues... (Hunter, 1999).

Though communist sympathizers and fellow travelers received more sympathy in the 1930s than at any other point in American history, mounting anticommunism in the late '30s and early '40s became a prelude to the subsequent 'Second' Red Scare that is most often associated with the late '40s and '50s. In 1938, Bertha Capen Reynolds, a member of the Communist Party, was forced to resign from her position at the Smith College School of Social Work for her Marxist teaching and her attempts to unionize the faculty. In the early 1940s, Dies Committees targeted several unions that represented social workers and declared *Social Work Today* a "communist front" (Hunter, 1999). These political attacks on radical social workers moderated its radicalism and stalled its labor organizing. With the onset of World War II in the early 1940s, the movement fizzled, paving the way for social work to shore up its commitment to professional institution-building.

Readings on the Societal Context for the Red Scare Interregnum

Denning, M. (2009). The age of the CIO. *American Studies: an Anthology*, 166-176.

Excerpt from Review (Nystrom, 1998): "In this exhaustive reconstruction of the cultural formations that accompanied what he terms 'the age of the CIO,' Michael Denning offers a daring, revisionist account of the legacy of the Popular Front and the 1930s. He argues that the "cultural front reshaped American culture," constituting something like a "second American Renaissance" which transformed the political and cultural life of the nation (xvi)...With this theoretical re-orientation, Denning turns our attention to the institutions,

movements, cultural apparatuses, and audiences that shaped the culture of the Popular Front. He shows how this culture--which he characterizes as social democratic, laborist, anti-racist and anti-Fascist--was the product of both the social movements built by and based on the massive wave of unionization which marked the birth of the CIO as well as the unprecedented development of the culture industries.” []

Ehrenreich, J.H. (1985). The construction of the welfare state (pp. 78–101). In *The altruistic imagination: A History of social work and social policy in the United States*. Cornell University Press.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7591/j.ctt5hh20f.6>

Summary: Ehrenreich demonstrates that social work’s emphasis has always vacillated between individual treatment and social reform. Tracing this ever-changing focus from the Progressive Era, through the development of the welfare state, the New Deal, and the affluent 1950s and 1960s, into the administration of Ronald Reagan, he places the evolution of social work in the context of political, cultural, and ideological trends, noting the paradoxes inherent in the attempt to provide essential services and reflect at the same time the intentions of the state. He concludes by examining the turning point faced by the social work profession in the 1980s, indicated by a return to casework and a withdrawal from social policy concerns.

Goldstein, R.J. (2014). *Little 'Red Scares': Anti-Communism and political repression in the United States, 1921-1946*. Routledge.

Back cover: Anti-communism has long been a potent force in American politics, capable of gripping both government and popular attention. Nowhere is this more evident than in the two great 'red scares' of 1919-20 and 1946-54; the latter generally - if somewhat inaccurately - termed McCarthyism. The interlude between these two major scares has tended to garner less attention, but as this volume makes clear, the lingering effects of 1919-20 and the gathering storm clouds of 'McCarthyism' were clearly visible throughout the 20s and 30s, even if in a more low-key way. Indeed, the period between the two great red scares was marked by frequent instances of political repression, often justified on anti-communist grounds, at local, state, and federal levels. Yet these events have been curiously neglected in the history of American political repression and anti-communism, perhaps because much of the material deals with events scattered in time and space which never reached the intensity of the two great scares. By focusing on this twenty-five-year 'interim' period, the essays in this collection bridge the gap between the two high-profile 'red scares' thus offering a much more contextualized and fluid narrative for American anti-communism. In so doing the rationale and motivations for the 'red scares' can be seen as part of an evolving political landscape, rather than as isolated bouts of hysteria exploding onto - and then vanishing from - the political scene. Instead, a much more nuanced appreciation of the conflicting interests and fears of government, politicians, organized labor, free-speech advocates, employers, and the press is offered, which will be of interest to anyone wishing to better understand the political history of modern America.

Goodall, A. (2008). The battle of Detroit and anti-communism in the Depression Era. *The Historical Journal*, 51(2), 457–480. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20175169>

Summary: Explores Diego Rivera's visit to Detroit in 1932-3. It seeks to use his experiences, and in particular the spectacular popular reaction to the “Detroit Industry” murals he painted, as a prism for analyzing varieties of anti-communism in Detroit in the Depression Era. The article argues that close relationships between private capitalists, most notably Henry Ford and a Mexican communist, expose contradictions in big business's use of anti-communism in the interwar period, and suggest that anti-communism was a more complicated phenomenon than simply a tool for the promotion of 'free enterprise.' Moreover, by comparing the public reaction to the artist’s work with their original intent, it is possible to see how members of Detroit's society unconsciously used anti-communism to sublimate broader concerns over race and ethnicity, gender, politics, and religiosity in a region in the throes of profound social change. The article seeks to highlight elements of these latent anxieties and fears in order to show how anti-communism acted as a vessel for social debate.

Primary Sources and More on the Impact of the Red Scare Interregnum on Social Work

van Kleeck, M. (1934). Our illusions regarding government. *Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, 1934* (pp. 473-485). Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Mary Van Kleeck's papers are at Smith College <https://findingaids.smith.edu/repositories/2/resources/501>

Summary: This speech, presented by social worker and labor economist Mary van Kleeck at the National Conference of Social Work in 1934, addresses the social work profession's relationship to politics and economics. In the introduction to a published excerpt, editors of *The Survey* wrote, "Miss van Kleeck's address produced more heat, and for many social workers more light, than any other at the Conference... members may give special consideration to Miss van Kleeck's argument that welfare services of the kind advocated by the Association at its conference on Governmental Objectives cannot be secured through the instrumentality of government in our present economic system and that social workers should ally themselves with workers in industry in support of a new economic order if they are genuinely concerned to establish security and raise standards of living."

Home Relief Bureau Employees Association (1935, April). Spies, dismissals, discrimination: The report of the Investigating Committee of the Association of Workers in Social Agencies. Jacob Fisher Papers, (Box 1, Folder 9). Social Welfare History Archives, University of Minnesota.

Summary: The firings of union officers and activists and other forms of harassment pushed unions to intensify their use of militant tactics. In New York City, the Home Relief Bureau Employee's Association accused the HRB administration of a concerted campaign to break the union by the use of arbitrary firings of union officers, and surveillance of union activities and discriminatory treatment of union employees. The union formed a Joint Committee of rank-and-file unions to investigate their charges and submit a public report. In April, the Joint Committee publicly released its report at a meeting attended by HRB employees and administrative staff. The report supported the charges of the union that the HRB had conducted a campaign of discrimination against the union and called for the reinstatement of four union officials fired for inefficiency and insubordination. In addition, the committee called for the end of police presence in HRB offices, discriminatory treatment of union members in job assignments and evaluations, and a system in which the committee alleged the HRB forced some employees to spy upon the activities of union co-workers. See also: Slater, M. (1935). Spying, discrimination, dismissals. *Social Work Today, 2*(6), 13-14.

van Kleeck, M. (1935). Sources of power for the social work program. Do we need a labor party? *Social Work Today, 3*(3), 8-11.

Summary: In *Social Work Today*, the journal of the Rank and File Movement, van Kleeck analyzes the political potential of social workers to ally with organized labor and form a new political party to the left of the Democratic Party. In this article, van Kleeck argues that the New Deal has insufficiently addressed social needs and that the Roosevelt administration prioritized the needs of business over public welfare.

Gilpin, D. (1935, November). Fired for "inefficiency." *Social Work Today, 11-14*.

Summary: Gilpin, a social worker in the Kansas City Bureau for Men, illustrates how caseworkers were caught between pressures from management and the political realities of providing relief to unemployed clients. During his two years at the Bureau, Gilpin emphasized forming relationships with his clients as a rejection of the "efficiency" model of service delivery. As a member of the AWU, a union of rank-and-file relief workers, Gilpin agitated alongside aid recipients against program cuts. "During the second week in August relief was drastically cut in Kansas City... What caused this? Perhaps the reason lies beneath the reams of red tape that Harry Hopkins uses to wrap each appropriation in," Gilpin writes. As evidence of anticommunism within the ranks of the profession, Gilpin notes how, "Rank and file members were accused of being disloyal to the agency, of being 'reds' and disgruntled, inefficient workers."

Reynolds, B.C. (1935). Whom do social workers serve? *Social Work Today, 2*(6), 5-8.

Summary: In this widely circulated article, published in the journal of the Rank-and-File Movement three years before she was forced to resign from her position at the Smith College School for Social Work, Bertha Capen Reynolds challenges the profession, asking how social workers should navigate between the interests of government, employers, and their clients.

Fisher, J. (1936). *The Rank and File Movement in Social Work, 1931-1936*. New York School of Social Work.

Summary: More than an idea, the rank-and-file movement became active around the country. It organized social workers in about 35 public agencies in 15 large cities, a dozen Pennsylvania counties, half a dozen Michigan counties, and several Ohio counties. It worked in Jewish protective agencies in five cities; held open forums in half a dozen others; founded practitioner groups in three chapters of the American Association of Social Workers and case worker councils in half a dozen family agencies. It organized within the National Conference of Social Work, the National Conference of Jewish Social Service, and the National Coordinating Committee of Rank and File Groups in Social Work. It played key roles in the publication of *Social Work Today*. The great majority of its 15,000 work in public relief agencies. Some 12,000 are members of the 17 organizations affiliated with the National Coordinating Committee.

van Kleeck, M. (1937, May). The social program of the labor movement. Presentation at the National Conference of Social Work. <https://socialwelfare.library.vcu.edu/eras/great-depression/social-work-labor-movement-1937/>

Summary: In this 1937 presentation to the National Conference of Social Work, Mary van Kleeck reflected on the transformation of social work in light of the emergence of the public welfare apparatus. Once again, van Kleeck advocates that social workers become politically active in favor of a strong welfare state. "During this same period, social work has shifted its base from unofficial programs, privately supported, with the community chest as the symbol of the source of influence and control, to a government program which is now recognized as the major branch of social work. Along with that shift, social workers must recognize that their "bosses" are no longer the same. It is no longer the community chest or its counterpart which will determine the program of social work. That program in its major branch will have to be molded by the same forces which are influencing the government in many of its aspects. These forces and their interrelationship are the results of developments in labor's economic organization. It is desirable to sketch at this moment the main points in the development of this industrial unionism and what it signifies. Out of this analysis may come some basis for forecast as to the kind of social program which may be expected to develop out of this situation. Beyond that, certain implications for the future of social work may be foreseen."

Social Work Today. Supplement to Memorandum of October, 1940," Harry Lurie Papers, (Box 1, Folder 13), Social Welfare History Archives, University of Minnesota.

Summary: A response to a mimeographed document accusing 46 social workers affiliated with *Social Work Today* and the Rank and File movement of being Communists.

Feuer, L.S. (1962). American travelers to the Soviet Union 1917-32: The formation of a component of New Deal ideology. *American Quarterly*, 14(2), 119-149. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2710637>

Summary: This article describes the American exchange with the Soviet Union between the two great Red Scares and traces how Soviet ideology inspired support for the New Deal and social programs in America. Feuer notes that many practicing social workers were curious about or expressly sympathetic to Soviet-style communism, and a number of American social workers visited the Soviet Union for the purposes of social exchange and to learn about state-managed welfare bureaucracy.

Haynes, J.E. (1975). The "Rank and File Movement" in private social work. *Labor History*, 16(1), 78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00236567508584323>

Summary: In the spring of 1931, young social workers from various New York City private agencies staged a debate on the nature of the Great Depression leading the organization of the Social Workers Discussion Club (SWDC). The SWDC characterized itself as “an open forum for the analysis of basic problems and their relation to social work,” but also took up social action. At the club's first meeting in 1932, following a talk by a speaker from the Communist-sponsored Amsterdam Congress against War, its members promptly endorsed the Congress. Within a year, the SWDC elected delegates to the First U.S. Congress Against War (also a Communist-sponsored group), supported an unemployed march to City Hall, contributed funds to the Communist-led “Hunger March” to Washington D.C., and endorsed the “Workers Unemployment Insurance Bill” authored by Farmer-Labor Congressman Ernest Lundeen of Minnesota. Initially focused on educational and political activities, the SWDCs soon turned to occupational issues such as wages and caseload.

Ehrenreich, J.H. (1985). The crisis in social work, 1929–1945. In *The altruistic imagination: A history of social work and social policy in the United States* (pp. 102–138). Cornell University Press.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7591/j.ctt5hh20f.7>

Summary: This chapter of Ehrenreich's book details conflict within the social work profession regarding the occupation's response to the economic crisis of the Depression.

Hunter R.I. (1999). *Voices of our past: the rank and file movement in social work, 1931-1950*. Dissertations and Theses. Paper 1602. Portland State University. https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds/1602/

Summary: During the late 1920s through the late 1940s, American social workers developed a vital radical trade union organizing effort known as the “rank and file movement.” Born within the growing economic crisis of the 1920s and maturing in the national economic collapse and social upheaval marked by the Great Depression, thousands of professional social workers and uncredentialed relief workers joined the rank-and-file movement to organize social service workers along the lines of industrial unionism. Within its relatively short lifespan, the rank-and-file movement grew in size and influence to challenge both the prevailing definitions of professional social work and the essence of the practice. This study informs the enduring legacy of the rank-and-file movement within the dynamic world of social work. It does so by: 1) locating the history of the rank and file movement within the context of an evolving profession; 2) analyzing this specific history of a profession within the context of broader social and political forces that defined both the limits and potentials of that evolution; and 3) assessing the implications of this history for social work in terms of its past, present and future.

The Second Red Scare (or “McCarthyism”): 1945-1957

From the late 1940s through the 1950s—the opening phases of the Cold War with the Soviet Union—fear of communism permeated American politics, culture, and society. Named after Senator Joseph McCarthy (R-Wisconsin) who led the attack, “McCarthyism” undermined political opponents with unsubstantiated attacks on their loyalty to the United States. The Federal government, states, and many private organizations required employees to sign loyalty oaths. The climate of fear, combined with the absence of critical oversight by the Justice Department and the White House, encouraged support for red scare tactics from both liberals and conservatives. Extending beyond McCarthy's term in the senate, the Second Red Scare became the most widespread episode of political repression in the history of the United States. From 1938 through 1969 three federal bodies—The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the House Un-American Committee (HUAC), and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee (SISS) along with many state agencies led the domestic “debate” over internal security.

By branding liberal individuals and progressive organizations as “Communist,” the repressive actions of the US government ruined marriages, ended friendships, destroyed careers, shuttered progressive organizations, curtailed social reform, and trampled basic civil rights. The wave of suspicion and often anonymous accusations reached far into the lives of ordinary people and the halls of mainstream organizations. Libraries removed *The Adventures of Robin Hood* from their shelves because the book advocated robbing the rich and giving to the poor. In 1950, a Bartlesville, Oklahoma public library, fired its senior librarian Ruth W. Brown, charging that the library held “subversive” periodicals and that she supported equal treatment of African Americans. The cold war hysteria also led opponents of the expanding welfare state

to discredit New Deal programs as communism and socialism, Hollywood to blacklist artists, the CIO to purge its more radical unions, including those representing public and private sector social workers, and southern segregationists to insist that Moscow controlled the civil rights movement. The Red Scare tore through the federal government, driving out feminists, homosexuals, and civil rights activists along with ordinary civil servants who sympathized with the African American and other freedom struggles (Lieberman & Lang, 2009). Because the Communist Party supported equal rights for all, the government referred to anyone including social workers who supported these movements as communists. Eventually, leading labor, civil rights, feminist, and professional organizations distanced themselves from or purged anyone thought to be a communist. The suspicions of the Red Scare made it difficult for any reform movement to persist (Arnesen, 2012).

Thanks largely to the work of Reisch and Andrews (see below), we know that social workers did not escape the anti-Communist furor. The post-World War II Red Scare deeply affected individual social workers, social work education, social welfare programs, and the social work profession. From the Ivy League to state universities and small private colleges, administrators fired faculty who failed to cooperate with congressional investigations. The FBI investigated two junior faculty at the University of Connecticut, School of Social Work: Robert Glass and Harold Lewis, both of whom lost their jobs. (Glass later became a Professor of Social Work at Fordham University, and Lewis became the Dean at the Hunter College School of Social Work.) In the late 1940s Marion Hathway, a major social work leader, advocate of individual freedom and collective security, and member of the University of Pittsburgh faculty also came under attack. Despite support from some in social work, the ongoing charges of communism made by local community and business leaders as well as the members of the university's corporate board forced Hathway to resign from the university. The House Un-American Committee also investigated Inabel Lindsay, activist, advocate for racial justice, and founding dean of Howard School of Social Work, as a suspected Communist. In the 1940s, the government targeted Eduard Lindeman a social activist and professor of community organizing at Columbia University School of Social Work and Ira Krasner on the faculty at Wayne State University School of Social Work. The University of California, School of Social Work at Berkeley dismissed Erik Erikson and 35 other faculty who refused to sign a loyalty oath.

The Red Scare also engulfed social workers employed by public and private sector agencies, even those associated with modest reforms. As noted above, the FBI began targeting public sector workers in the Rank-and-File Movement and *Social Work Today in the late 1930s*. Throughout 1950s and 1960s, the FBI continued to call social workers, especially those calling for economic security, peace, internationalism and human rights, before congressional committees; subjected them to loyalty oaths; charged them as "security risks"; and hounded their families, friends, and neighbors. Some public and private voluntary agencies complied with anti-communist investigations. They volunteered information to FBI investigations, dismissed left-leaning staff, cut social program funding, disengaged from "group work" and work with the poor, and actively pursued professionalization rather than social change. By and large, social work's professional organizations—along with leading labor, civil rights, and women's organization—distanced themselves from or fired social workers investigated by the FBI.

Jacob Fisher, active in social work's "Rank and File Movement" in the 1930s and a known radical, lost his job at the Social Security Administration. Unable to find work, he left the field. The US government suppressed *Common Human Needs* (1945) because the book supported the new welfare state programs. Originally commissioned by the Social Security Administration (SSA) and written by Charlotte Towle a SSA employee, the Government Printing Office ceased publication of *Common Human Needs* in 1954 and destroyed its inventory on the grounds that it was socialistic. (NASW subsequently republished the book, now a classic.) HUAC attacked Verne Weed, a member of the Rank-and-File Movement in social work in the 1930s, later a caseworker and an agency administrator. After losing her social work job, Weed faced accusations again in the mid-1950s for signing the Stockholm Peace Appeal. She eventually taught as an adjunct at Hunter College School of Social Work. Sherman Kabovitz, a group worker and Communist Party organizer, spent a month in solitary confinement and barely avoided a two-year prison sentence. He later worked as a professor at New Jersey's Richard Stockton College. Both group workers and settlement house workers underwent constant attack well into the 1960s. When Meyer Schreiber took a job at the Children's Bureau in 1964, the government investigated the political activities of his youth.

Occurring just as social work matured as a profession, the suspicion, fear, and marginalization wrought by McCarthyism had a long-term impact on social work's ideology and practice. The Second Red Scare successfully limited the

development of the New Deal, restricted the activities of social movements, especially the increasingly powerful labor movement, and silenced many social workers and other reformers who argued that saving democracy required attacking economic and social inequalities. Social work retreated from its New Deal and World War II progressive and reformist orientation, narrowed its goals, silenced dissent, limited the content of social work education and journals to non-controversial issues, and diluted its support for social change, social justice, and economic equality. While some in social work continued to echo anti-communism, others critiqued the profession's cooperation with McCarthyism. In the end, the Red Scare diminished the role social workers would play in the War on Poverty of the 1960s and left social workers ill-prepared for the upheavals of that decade and created schisms with potential allies that have persisted to the present.

References

- Arnesen, E. (2012). Civil Rights and the Cold War at home. Postwar activism, anticommunism and the decline of the left. *American Communists History*, 11(1), 5-44
- Lieberman, R. & Lang, C. (2009). *Anticommunism and the African American freedom movement: Another side of the story*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schrecker, E. (1986). *No ivory tower: McCarthyism and the universities*. Oxford University Press.
- Storrs, L. R. (2013). *The Second Red Scare and the unmaking of the New Deal left*. Princeton University Press.

Readings on the Societal Context of the Second Red Scare

Arnesen, E. (2012). Civil Rights and the Cold War at home. Postwar activism, anticommunism and the decline of the left. *American Communists History*, 11(1), 5-44

Part summary and part publisher's overview: An historiographical reappraisal of the role played by the Communist Party in post-World War II American politics and society. Argues that anti-communist practices by many civil rights movement organizations worked in their favor for surviving the McCarthyism period. However, they also harmed the movement in the long run fracturing coalitions expelling effective organizers and undermining the impact of the movement.

Fried, R.M. (1990). *Nightmare in red: The McCarthy Era in perspective*. Oxford University Press.

From publisher's overview: According to newspaper headlines and television pundits, the cold war ended many months ago; the age of Big Two confrontation is over. But forty years ago, Americans were experiencing the beginnings of another era--of the fevered anti-communism that came to be known as McCarthyism. During this period, the Cincinnati Reds felt compelled to rename themselves briefly the "Redlegs" to avoid confusion with the other reds, and one citizen in Indiana campaigned to have *The Adventures of Robin Hood* removed from library shelves because the story's subversive message encouraged robbing from the rich and giving to the poor. These developments grew out of a far-reaching anxiety over communism that characterized the McCarthy Era.

Gerard, C.J. (1993). "A program of cooperation": The FBI, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and the communist issue, 1950-1956. Unpublished Manuscript. Marquette University. Milwaukee, WI.

Summary: In March 1951, the Federal Bureau of Investigation established a formal, covert relationship with the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee (SISS). This previously undocumented alliance united two of the nation's influential political institutions in the 1950s, and together they played key roles in guiding the domestic debate over internal security issues. This study has relied principally upon the FBI file on the SISS, Bureau files on several trade unions, selected SISS papers at the National Archives, congressional hearings, documents from the Truman and Eisenhower Libraries, and the personal and office files of Senator Patrick McCarran and William E. Jenner. This study asks students to address the broader question of executive oversight, as neither the Justice Department nor the White House questioned the Bureau's authority to collect and disseminate information unrelated to the FBI's formal responsibility to investigate violations of federal law.

Lieberman, R. & Lang, C. (2009). *Anticommunism and the African American freedom movement: Another side of the story*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Summary: A collection of articles that update the history of the civil rights movement by extending its timeline, including its work in the North as well as the South and documenting the ways in which McCarthyism and Cold War terror disrupted, damaged and fractured the Black freedom struggle in the years after World War II.

Robbins, L.S. (1994). Anti-Communism, racism, and censorship in the McCarthy Era: The Case of Ruth W. Brown and the Bartlesville Public Library. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, 35(4), 331-334.

Summary: This research examines the case of Ruth W. Brown, long-time librarian of the Bartlesville, Oklahoma, Public Library, who was fired from her job in 1950 following charges by a citizens' committee that she had "subversive" periodicals in the library, charges that masked actual concerns about Brown's personal views and professional actions concerning equal treatment of African-Americans. The library board (which had also been ousted), friends of Brown, and friends of the library unsuccessfully challenged the legality of the action.¹ The Oklahoma Library Association quickly put together an Intellectual Freedom Committee to investigate the case and to give Brown what support it could.² The inability of the American Library Intellectual Freedom Committee to take prompt and effective action provided an impetus to increase the committee's power.

Schrecker, E. (1986). *No ivory tower: McCarthyism and the universities*. Oxford University Press.

Publisher's summary. The story of McCarthyism's traumatic impact on government employees and Hollywood screenwriters during the 1950s is all too familiar, but what happened on college and university campuses during this period is barely known. *No Ivory Tower* recounts the previously untold story of how the anti-Communist furor affected the nation's college teachers, administrators, trustees, and students. As Ellen Schrecker shows, the hundreds of professors who were called before HUAC and other committees confronted the same dilemma most other witnesses had faced. They had to decide whether to cooperate with the committees and "name names" or to refuse such cooperation and risk losing their jobs. Drawing on heretofore untouched archives and dozens of personal interviews, Schrecker re-creates the climate of fear that pervaded American campuses and made the nation's educational leaders worry about Communist subversion as well as about the damage that unfriendly witnesses might do to the reputations of their institutions. Noting that faculty members who failed to cooperate with congressional committees were usually fired even if they had tenure, Schrecker shows that these firings took place everywhere--at Ivy League universities, large state schools and small private colleges. The presence of an unofficial but effective blacklist, she reveals, meant that most of these unfrocked professors were unable to find regular college teaching jobs in the U.S. until the 1960s, after the McCarthyist furor had begun to subside. *No Ivory Tower* offers new perspectives on McCarthyism as a political movement and helps to explain how that movement, which many people even then saw as a betrayal of this nation's most cherished ideals, gained so much power.

Schrecker, E. (1998). *Many are the crimes: McCarthyism in America*. Little Brown.

Part summary and part publisher's overview: The McCarthy era was a bad time for freedom in America. Encompassing far more than the brief career of Senator Joseph McCarthy, it was the most widespread episode of political repression in the history of the United States. In the name of National Security, most Americans--liberal and conservative alike--supported the anti-Communist crusade that ruined so many careers, marriages, and even lives. Tracing the way that a network of dedicated anticommunists created blacklists and destroyed organizations, this broad-based inquiry reveals the connections between McCarthyism's disparate elements in the belief that understanding its terrible mechanics can prevent a repetition.

Schrecker, E. (2000). McCarthyism and organized labor: Fifty years of lost opportunities. *Armonk*, 3(5), 93-101.

Publisher's Preview: Alger Hiss did not belong to a union, but Julius Rosenberg did and so, too, did most of the Hollywood Ten. And, more important, so did thousands of the ordinary men and women who came into conflict with the wave of anticommunist political repression that we now call McCarthyism. Though the labor movement never got the attention that went to such high-profile targets as Hollywood or the State Department, it may well have been the most important institutional victim of the McCarthy era. By the time that era came to an end,

American labor had been purged of its most radical members, a process that destroyed much of its militancy and political independence.

Simmons, J. (1982). The origins of the campaign to abolish HUAC, 1956-1961, the California connection. *Southern California Quarterly*, 64(2), 141-157.

Abstract: The recent creation of a Senate Subcommittee on Security and Terrorism and proposals for a similar body in the House have generated fears within the liberal community that a new McCarthy-ism is on the rise in America. In large part, these fears are based on liberals' experience with the House Un-American Activities Committee. Throughout its thirty-year existence, HUAC was anathema to liberals and civil libertarians. From its first public hearing in 1938 through its final demise in 1969, the Committee sought, and all too often succeeded, in branding as Communist liberals and the organizations to which they belonged. In the process, HUAC fostered a blacklist, destroyed careers, and trampled upon basic civil rights. Its members ignored the right to privacy of political belief, engaged in the worst kind of guilt by association, and used their access to the media as a means of punishing through exposure.

Storrs, L. R. (2013). *The Second Red Scare and the unmaking of the New Deal left*. Princeton University Press.

Back book cover: In the name of protecting Americans from Soviet espionage, the post-1945 Red Scare curtailed the reform agenda of the New Deal. The crisis of the Great Depression had brought into government a group of policy experts who argued that saving democracy required attacking economic and social inequalities. The influence of these men and women within the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration, and their alliances with progressive social movements, elicited a powerful reaction from conservatives, who accused them of being subversives. Landon Storrs draws on newly declassified records of the federal employee loyalty program—created in response to claims that Communists were infiltrating the U.S. government—to reveal how disloyalty charges were used to silence these New Dealers and discredit their policies.

Storrs, L.R. (2015). McCarthyism and the Second Red Scare. *Oxford Research Encyclopedias, American History*. doi:10.1093/acrefore/9780199329175.013.6

Back book cover: The second Red Scare refers to the fear of communism that permeated American politics, culture, and society from the late 1940s through the 1950s, during the opening phases of the Cold War with the Soviet Union. This episode of political repression lasted longer and was more pervasive than the Red Scare that followed the Bolshevik Revolution and World War I. Popularly known as “McCarthyism” after Senator Joseph McCarthy (R-Wisconsin), who made himself famous in 1950 by claiming that large numbers of Communists had infiltrated the U.S. State Department, the second Red Scare predated and outlasted McCarthy, and its machinery far exceeded the reach of a single maverick politician. Nonetheless, “McCarthyism” became the label for the tactic of undermining political opponents by making unsubstantiated attacks on their loyalty to the United States.

Woods, J. (2004). *Back struggle, Red Scare: Segregation and Anti-Communism in the South, 1948–1968*. Louisiana State University Press.

Summary: Offers a view of the Southern Red Scare during the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s as segregation and anti-Communism become mutually reinforcing force in an extreme southern nationalism or the desire to protect the Southern way of life” from people, groups, and movements viewed as outside threats. Directed by an interlocking network of local, state, and national institutions including Congressional committees, they dedicated huge amounts of time, money, and human resources to expose Communists in the Civil Rights Movement or what they referred the black and red conspiracy.

Primary Sources and More on Impact of Second Red Scare on Social Work

Reynolds, B. C. (1953). Fear in our culture. Paper presented at the Cleveland Council of Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

Summary: In 1953, Bertha Capen Reynolds was unable to present at NASW due to the influence of McCarthyism. Instead, she gave this paper about the detrimental impact of the Red Scare on social reform efforts at the Cleveland Council of Arts, Sciences, and Professions conference.

Reynolds, B. C. (1963). *An uncharted journey*. The Citadel Press. Available online

Summary: Bertha Capen Reynolds' autobiography details the professional trajectory of one of social work's most prominent members who was forced to resign due to her Marxist political commitments.

Wilson, G. (1978). Interview. In V.S. Grayson (Ed.), *NASW Oral History Project*. Columbia University Press.

Summary: In her oral history interview, Gertrude Wilson discusses the ways in which the field of Group Work was marginalized within the profession as a result of McCarthyism.

Weed, V. (1985). The importance of community organizing. *Catalyst*, 5(1), 83-85.

Summary: Verne Weed discusses her activism in the Rank and File Movement and the experience of being investigated by HUAC during the McCarthy Era. Weed also reflects on the position of community organizing within the social work profession.

Lewis, H. (1992). Some thoughts on my forty years in social work education. *Journal of Progressive Human Services*. 3(1), 39-51.

Summary: In this article, Harold Lewis reflects on the impact of professional social work's marginalization of group work during the McCarthy era.

Schreiber, M.S. (1995). Labeling a social worker a national security risk: A memoir. *Social Work*, 40(5), 656-660.

Abstract: The social work and social welfare literature makes few references to political repression and other measures that threaten the civil liberties of social workers. This memoir discusses the experience of a social worker who, as a federal employee, underwent a Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) loyalty review to determine whether he was a national security risk. Using the Freedom of Information Reform Act of 1986, he obtained his FBI file, which revealed considerable information about FBI procedures and operations as well as about social agencies and social workers. Are social workers safe from political repression as they seek to change the social order to create social justice for all? The author challenges social work and social welfare to be more committed to advancing the civil rights of social workers and of all Americans.

Andrews, J., & Reisch, M. (1997a). Social work and anti-communism: A historical analysis of the McCarthy era. *Journal of Progressive Human Services*, 8(2), 29-49.

First paragraph of Introduction: This article explores the impact of anti-communism/McCarthyism on the ideology, education and practice of social work. It analyzes how the widespread fear, purges and political conservatism of the McCarthy period diminished the gains the social work profession had made in the 1930s and 1940s through its participation in progressive activities and left the profession ill-prepared for the changing political and social climate of the 1960s and 1970s.

Andrews, J., & Reisch, M. (1997b). The legacy of McCarthyism on social group work: An historical analysis. *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*, 24(3), 211-237.

Abstract: This paper explores the impact of McCarthyism on the ideology, education, practice, and public image of group work. The authors argue that the witch hunts that occurred during the period and its climate of widespread fear purges and political conservatism diminished the gains the social work profession had made in

the 1930s and 1940s through its participation in progressive activities and left the profession, particularly social group work ill-prepared for the issues and activism of the 1960s and 1970s.

Reisch, M., & Andrews, J. (1999). Uncovering a silent betrayal: Using oral history to explore the impact of McCarthyism. *The Oral History Review*, 26(2), 87-106.

First paragraph of Introduction: Although seldom discussed, the politics of anti-Communism (often labeled McCarthyism) in the post-World War II era had a long-lasting influence on domestic social policies and the development of the social work profession.' (While this political climate appeared a decade before Senator Joseph McCarthy became nationally prominent, his name is most closely associated with the period, dating roughly from 1945-1960.) Through its impact on the ideology and practice of social work, McCarthyism influenced its overall societal goals, its conception of the relationship between professionalism and social change, the role of social reform in social policy development, the demographics of the profession, and the profession's public image. It led organized social work to retreat from the progressive and reformist orientation it adopted during the New Deal and World War II. This diminished the role social workers would play in the War on Poverty of the 1960s. It also left them ill-prepared for the upheavals.

Reisch, M., & Andrews, J. (2002). Anti-Communism and the attack on the New Deal (Ch.5, pp.87- 114); The social work response to McCarthyism (Ch. 6, pp.115-188) in *The Road Not Taken: A History of Radical Social Work in the United States*. Routledge.

Summary: Looks at the evolution of social work in the United States driven by both mainstream organizations and politics, but also by the ideas and experiences of radical individuals and marginalized groups. Traces the history of social work from the perspective of social workers who committed to a radical approach. Many were ostracized and some even lost their jobs. During the 1960s and 1970s, radical social work experienced a revival as the War on Poverty encouraged community action and a welfare rights approach.

Statler, M. (2003). A Sign of the times: McCarthyism in operation at the University of Connecticut

Summary: Unpublished paper by a University of Connecticut history student examines McCarthyism at the University of Connecticut in the early 1950s. Argues that McCarthyism consisted both of governmental investigations and public compliance that contributed to the power of Senator McCarthy. The Committee of Five (faculty) created by the University targeted four faculty included two from well-regarded assistant professors in the School of Social Work: Harold Lewis and Robert Glass. Claiming that both were Communists, the University fired both Lewis and Glass despite praise and support from the Social Work Dean and Faculty, Both suffered considerable pain and loss, Lewis eventually taught at University of Pennsylvania and for many years and later served as dean of Hunter College School of Social Work, City University of New York.

Leighninger, L. (2004). Social work and McCarthyism in the early 1950s. *Journal of Progressive Human Services*, 15(1), 61-67.

First paragraph of article: In May 2003, the transcripts of Senator Joseph R. McCarthy's closed-door sessions of the Senate's Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations were made public. These sessions were used to eliminate potential witnesses "who could adequately defend themselves against his browbeating," and who would therefore not make good candidates for his public hearings. According to a McCarthy biographer, David Oshinsky, the transcripts reveal someone desperately trying to push a conspiracy theory and "using all the badgering, bullying tactics in private that he was known for in public" (Stolberg, 2003). The opening of these records reminds us of the turmoil of that period of American history, when people from many walks of life—government workers, people in the motion picture industry, writers, and even social workers—particularly public welfare workers—were victims of a hysterical anti-Communist movement. The list of those brought before the closed-door McCarthy sessions includes Mary Van Kleeck, the director of industrial studies at the Russell Sage Foundation, who spoke for a radical wing within the social work profession.

Social Welfare History Project (2011). Marion Hathway (1895-1955) Social Worker and Educator. <https://socialwelfare.library.vcu.edu/people/hathway-marion/>

Summary: Short biography of Marion Hathway, a prominent social work leader for many years, includes her experience as a target during the Second Red Scare. During the late 1940's and into the 1950's, Hathway was charged by a few prominent Pittsburgh citizens and officials with participating in "leftist" and Communist front activities. Suspicion about her political activities grew from Hathway's controversial role as leader of the Progressive Party campaign in Pittsburgh and her membership in the national Wallace for President Committee and her name on the list as sponsor of the 1949 Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, an organization that the local press claimed invited "Russian communists and their sympathizers to denounce the United States" (*Pittsburgh News*, July 25, 1951). She was also active in labor movements and in the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. In 1950, Judge Blair F. Gunther accused Hathway of teaching "young folks that there is something wrong with this country" (*Pittsburgh News*, March 17, 1950) and demanded that the state of Pennsylvania cut off all aid to the University of Pittsburgh if Hathway was not discharged. No charges were substantiated and no legal action was taken.

Quam, J. (2013). Bertha Capen Reynolds (1885-1978) *Encyclopedia of Social Work*. Oxford University Press NASW. <https://oxfordre.com/socialwork/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199975839.001.0001/acrefore-9780199975839-e-770>

Summary: Bertha Capen Reynolds (1885-1978), social worker, educator, Marxist, and activist, advocated for the working class and oppressed groups. She was associate director of Smith College School for Social Work (1925-1938), but was asked to leave because of her union activities.

O'Rourke, B. K., & Bishop, Z.R. (2019). "Now is the proper time for a foreigner to say a word": The rhetorical agency of Hilda Satt Polacheck. *Journal of American Ethnic History*, 39(1), 66–97. <https://doi.org/10.5406/jamerethnhist.39.1.0066>

Abstract: Explores the rhetorical agency of Hilda Satt Polacheck, author of *I Came a Stranger: The Story of a Hull-House Girl*, the only known memoir of life at Hull-House written by an immigrant woman. Polacheck wrote the memoir during the 1950s and 1960s, and her daughter, Dena Epstein, edited the manuscript for posthumous publication in 1989. *I Came a Stranger* focused on the influence of Jane Addams on Polacheck's early twentieth century experiences as a "Hull-House girl" and how she became an American at the social settlement. Although the memoir ends in 1935 with the death of Jane Addams, Polacheck's writings and political activities after 1935 shed new light on the author's reconstruction of her experiences at Hull-House. When Polacheck began writing the memoir in the 1950s, the FBI was investigating her and her adult children for alleged un-American activities. This article considers how Polacheck reconstructed her rhetorical agency and authority after Jane Addams' death to promote a more expansive and tolerant Americanism during the politically repressive Cold War era.

Stewart, J. (2019). Bertha Capen Reynolds (1885-1878). <https://www.historyofsocialwork.org/eng/index.php>; https://www.historyofsocialwork.org/eng/details.php?cps=11&canon_id=176

Summary: A brief biography of Bertha Capen Reynolds famed social work educator and associate director of Smith College School for Social Work (1925-1938) practitioner with the National Maritime Union, where she developed short-term social work interventions as an alternative to the long-term nature of social casework. In the early 1950's, Bertha Reynolds became a victim of McCarthyism and the social work community basically expelled her and Smith College asked to leave. However, she remained active as a social worker, trainer, and author. Reynolds also authored several books well-received books including *Between Client and Community* (1934/1973), *Learning and Teaching in the Practice of Social Work* (1942), *Social Work and Social Living: Explorations in Philosophy and Practice* (1951/1975), and *An Uncharted Journey* (1963). Fortunately, the social work community has since rehabilitated her and now considers her a founding mother of strength-based social work.

Archival Collections: Primary Sources regarding Red Scares

Archives collect and preserve historical documents (also called primary sources) in personal papers and organizational records. These offer a unique, first-hand perspective on history. The collection descriptions below are re-printed below from each archival collection and offer a starting point for further research on the impact of red scares on members of the social work profession. For more information on the collections and how to access them, researchers can review the collection guides linked in this bibliography and contact the archives where collections are held.

Bertha Capen Reynolds papers, SSC-MS-00128, Sophia Smith Collection of Women's History, Smith College Libraries. Bertha C. Reynolds was a pioneer educator and practitioner in the field of social work and an innovative writer on broader social subjects. The Bertha C. Reynolds Papers consist of correspondence, writings, printed materials, memorabilia, and miscellaneous papers dating from 1907-1994.
<https://findingaids.smith.edu/repositories/2/resources/987>

Charlotte Towle Papers, 1915-1968, University of Chicago Library. Charlotte Towle (1896-1966), psychiatric social worker and theoretician in the fields of social work education and casework an author of *Common Human Needs*, was a professor in the School of Social Service Administration at the University of Chicago for over thirty years. The Towle Papers comprise 26 boxes of correspondence, teaching and administrative materials, manuscripts and research notes, offprints, awards, biographical material, journals, and photos.
<https://www.lib.uchicago.edu/e/src/findingaids/view.php?eadid=ICU.SPCL.TOWLE>

Chauncey Alexander papers, 1917-2004, University of Southern California, Doheny Library. The papers include files on the Bertha Capen Reynolds Society [Social Welfare Action Alliance].
<https://researchworks.oclc.org/archivegrid/archiveComponent/806970809>

Henry Street Settlement records, sw0058, Social Welfare History Archives, University of Minnesota. The Henry Street Settlement was founded by Lillian Wald in 1893 in the Lower East Side neighborhood of New York City, where it continues to operate today. The records include files related to communist charges leveled against Mobilization for Youth in 1964-1965.
<https://archives.lib.umn.edu/repositories/11/resources/2447>

Jacob Fisher papers, sw114 Social Welfare History Archives, University of Minnesota. The Jacob Fisher papers include papers relating to the National Coordinating Committee of Rank and File Groups in Social Work and its successor, the National Coordinating Committee of Social Service Employee Groups. They also contain Social Work Discussion Club pamphlets; proceedings, reports, and "Rank and File Bulletins" (1935-1936) from the National Convention of Rank and File Groups in Social Work. See also *The Post-War Purge of Federal Employees. The World That Made it and the Government's Loyalty-Security Program Today*.
<https://archives.lib.umn.edu/repositories/11/resources/688>

Marion Hathway papers, sw0219, Social Welfare History Archives, University of Minnesota. The papers document Marion Hathway's teaching and research career as a professor of social work at the University of Pittsburgh and Bryn Mawr College, her leadership role in professional social work organizations, and her activities in a number of political and social causes. The records include correspondence, articles, speeches, and resource files of newspaper clippings and other documents. Course materials include syllabi, notes, articles, papers, bibliographies, case studies, and other instructional resources. The Hathway Papers provide a window on the development of education and training for the social work profession, particularly in the late 1930s and 1940s. They also reflect Hathway's political and social activism on behalf of progressive causes, particularly for civil liberties and the labor movement, as well as charges that she was a Communist sympathizer.
<https://archives.lib.umn.edu/repositories/11/resources/5931>

Mary van Kleeck papers, SSC-MS-00165, Sophia Smith Collection of Women's History, Smith College Libraries. The papers are primarily composed of documents and materials produced by the professional and public activities of Mary van Kleeck, the bulk of which span the years from 1917 to 1960. Mary van Kleeck was involved in a wide variety of social, political, and economic studies and organizations over the course of her lifetime, and she saved much of the

correspondence, business, research, and printed materials related to her interests. The papers offer a rich cache of information about a variety of subjects, people, and organizations in the first half of the twentieth century, especially radical and progressive groups, from the international to the local level.

<https://findingaids.smith.edu/repositories/2/resources/501>

Ralph and Ruth Tefferteller papers, sw0203, Social Welfare History Archives, University of Minnesota.

Ralph and Ruth Tefferteller were social workers who spent much of their careers (from 1946 to 1967) at the Henry Street Settlement in New York City. The papers include files from Ralph Tefferteller's tenure at Highlander Folk School

<https://archives.lib.umn.edu/repositories/11/resources/2399>

https://umedia.lib.umn.edu/search?utf8=%E2%9C%93&facets%5Bcollection_name_s%5D%5B%5D=Ralph+and+Ruth+Tefferteller+Papers&sort=&q=%22Martin+Luther+King%22

United Neighborhood Houses of New York Records, SW0005, Social Welfare History Archives, University of Minnesota.

The United Neighborhood Houses of New York, Inc. (UNH) was founded by Mary K. Simkhovitch and John L. Elliott in 1900 as the Association of Neighborhood Workers, a federation of York City settlement houses. The Association was reorganized during World War I and incorporated as United Neighborhood Houses in 1920. The records include minutes, correspondence, memoranda, reports, publications, financial records, newspaper clippings, scrapbooks, personnel records, corporate documents, departmental and project records. There are materials related to the Lusk Committee (the 1910s-1920s) as well as loyalty oaths and loyalty investigations (1950-1955).

<https://archives.lib.umn.edu/repositories/11/resources/748>

Verne Weed Collection for Progressive Social Work, SW125. Social Welfare History Archives, University of Minnesota.

The Verne Weed Collection for Progressive Social Work includes material related to: 1) social work practice and services directed toward client entitlement and empowerment; 2) social work involvement in the peace, trade union, Black power, and civil rights movements, women's rights, welfare rights, political, and similar social justice movements; 3) movements to reform social work and 4) development and dissemination of theory that shapes progressive social work. The collection includes various donations of personal and professional papers of progressive social workers; published material such as newsletters, pamphlets, flyers, and clippings; and unpublished material such as correspondence, memoranda, conference and meeting records, course work and bibliographic material, and position papers received from individuals and organizations involved in progressive social work. The focus of the collection is on activities based in the United States, but evidence of contacts and involvement with other countries, particularly those with a socialist system, is evident.

<https://archives.lib.umn.edu/repositories/11/resources/2423>

Recommended Citation

Abramovitz, M., Toft, J., & Ginzky, K.E. (2022). *Red scares, political repression and social work: Why now?* [Annotated bibliography]. Social Welfare History Group: Bibliography of Scholarship in Social Welfare History (#102-1).