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THE CONSCIENCE OF THE COLD WAR:
GENDER, FEAR, AND CONSEQUENTIAL IN MARGARET
CHASE SMITH'S "DECLARATION OF CONSCIENCE"

Elizabeth Campbell

Taking a Stand

On June 1, 1950, freshman Senator Margaret Chase Smith, a moderate Republican from Maine, stood waiting on a DC Metro platform. The train that would take her to the Capitol was due any minute, and she was anxious about the day ahead. Her colleague, Senator Joseph McCarthy, the Republican senator from Wisconsin, greeted her on the platform. McCarthy noticed Smith's uneasy demeanor and addressed her: "Margaret, you look very serious. Are you going to make a speech?" "Yes, and you will not like it," she replied. McCarthy retorted, "Is it about me?" "Yes, but I'm not going to mention your name," Smith responded. Just a short time later, with McCarthy sitting a mere few rows behind her, Margaret Chase Smith stood on the Senate floor to decry McCarthy's Red Scare hysteria in her hallmark speech, aptly titled "A Declaration of Conscience."

By February 1950, many Americans had expressed anxiety regarding Communist infiltration in the government because they feared the Soviet Union's growing influence in the Cold War. Senator McCarthy gave a speech on February 9, 1950, condemning suspected communist loyalists and

---

spies in the United States government. McCarthy was granted seemingly unlimited power by the American people and the Senate itself to prosecute suspected communists at any cost, and by June, he was at his peak. Even those who sought to curtail his tactics, such as powerful Senator Millard Tydings of Maryland, could not deter McCarthy from his mission. Nevertheless, Margaret Chase Smith took McCarthy, a member of her own party, to task for the tyranny of his rhetoric. She used the “Declaration of Conscience” to implore her fellow Senators to “do some real soul searching and to weigh [their] consciences” at a time when policy was legislated on fear instead of fact.

When Margaret Chase Smith rose to address the chamber that June day, she faced a formidable opponent in Joseph McCarthy. Her speech, which was one of the first to denounce McCarthy’s tactics, was well-received at the time, and many news organizations and fellow senators praised Smith’s grit and forceful appeal to respect the ideals of free speech and organization unrestricted by slander. Yet, for four years until his censure in 1954, McCarthy would continue his brazen pursuit of suspected communists mostly undeterred by outside forces. The “Declaration of Conscience,” while lauded for its strong rhetoric and sensibility, ultimately failed to stop or constrain McCarthy’s machinations, and Smith, though praised for her tenacity, was unable to garner the support necessary for meaningful resistance. In spite of Margaret Chase Smith’s efforts, McCarthy was able to continue his campaign of suspicion and panic in the midst of the Cold War. Ultimately, national fear, sustained by the United States’ involvement in conflicts abroad and within the government, as well as gender norms, bolstered by the broader

---

3 Smith, Declaration of Conscience, 13.
antifeminist movement of the time, proved to work against Margaret Chase Smith and her message.

The Meteoric Rise of Joseph McCarthy’s Red Scare

A flurry of tense activity between the United States and the Soviet Union, and more broadly, the threat of communism, at the beginning of 1950 had set the American people on edge. Knowledge that the Soviet Union had acquired an atomic bomb in the summer of 1949 prompted the United States to rush to complete a hydrogen bomb.4 State Department official Alger Hiss, who was first accused of espionage for the Soviets in 1948 by former communist Whitaker Chambers, was convicted of perjury in connection with the charges early that year.5 On February 3, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover announced the capture of Manhattan Project physicist Klaus Fuchs, revealing him to be another Soviet spy.6 These two high-profile cases seemingly proved that the communists were duplicitous and unrelenting in their infiltration of American institutions. It was against this backdrop of publicized communist disclosures that McCarthy gave his February 9 speech at Wheeling, West Virginia, as part of a series of speeches honoring Abraham Lincoln’s birthday.7 He took the opportunity of the innocuous event to claim that he had the names of more than two-hundred people in the State Department who were loyal to the Communist Party and the

5 Hiss had been a part of Franklin Roosevelt’s delegation to the 1945 Yalta Conference and temporary secretary general of the United Nations at its founding in 1945, and it was believed that his Communist ties were subverting American foreign policy, Andrew J. Dunar, *America in the Fifties*, (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2006), 41-42.
7 Ibid., 39.
Soviet Union in his possession; in this way, McCarthy fueled the anti-communist frenzy that was already present in America since the end of World War II and since the forging of the Truman Doctrine in March 1947. McCarthy then spread his ideological fervor in speeches across America, often exaggerating the number of communist suspects or claiming to have been misquoted when his own numbers did not match up from speech to speech. The early days of the Red Scare had illuminated some American's ability to easily submit to fearmongering, and McCarthy used this revelation to his advantage.

As Joseph McCarthy's speeches gained traction, critics began to doubt the validity of his claims. The day after a February 20 speech in the Senate in which his figures, yet again, did not match up, a committee and investigative subcommittee were formed to probe McCarthy's assertions. Senator Millard Tydings headed the investigative subcommittee. A Democrat, he and his colleagues were suspicious of the Republican Wisconsinite's allegations, accusing him of "taking refuge in the Senate chamber, where he was immune from charges of slander." In other words, Tydings believed that McCarthy was abusing his power with no regard for personal or professional repercussions, and was able to do so because of his position and the stranglehold of fear present in the American public. The Tydings Committee heard evidence from Secretary of State Dean Acheson, General Conrad Snow, who was chair of the State Department's Loyalty Board, and Owen J. Lattimore, Director of the Walter Hines Page School of International Relations at The Johns Hopkins University. McCarthy had accused the latter of being Alger

---

8 Claims are varied on the exact number of suspected Communists McCarthy claimed to have with him, but most eyewitness accounts say 205, Ibid., 58.
9 Ibid., 40.
Hiss’ boss and a top Russian spy. At every turn, McCarthy used the hearings and his zealous rhetoric to bolster attention to his cause. Lattimore and others testifying before the Tydings Committee refuted accusations of communist leanings, and the evidence presented failed to support any of McCarthy’s accusations. At the time of Margaret Chase Smith’s speech, though, the Tydings Committee was still hearing evidence related to McCarthy’s claims, and the senator from Wisconsin was seemingly untouchable.

A Man’s World, The Boy’s Club: Gender in Cold War Society and Politics

To properly appreciate the gravity of Margaret Chase Smith’s speech is to acknowledge her presence as the only female in the Senate in 1950 and one of very few female legislators in national politics at that time. Concurrently, one must examine gender norms as they existed in post-World War II society and politics. Historian Susan M. Hartmann asserts that the continued perpetuation of gender stereotypes was an operative of the Cold War; generally, in order to maintain order in chaos, one must refrain from dissent, even in the expression of one’s gender. This meant promoting a traditional Judeo-Christian social framework in American society. In the years following World War II, many women who had worked during the war in industrial occupations returned to the home as veterans sought their old jobs. If a woman worked during this time, she was almost certainly confined to choosing from “traditional female occupations”

13 Ibid., 44.
15 Ibid., 84.
such as secretary work and housekeeping.\textsuperscript{16} According to post-war sensibilities, women were to adhere to the prevailing domestic ideal; that is, they were to stay home and care for their families. This idea mainly permeated white, suburban middle-class society. Although women gained the right to vote in 1919, by the beginning of the Cold War, support for women’s issues had waned, and antifeminist sentiment consistent with enforced gender ideals was ever-present. Notably, in 1945 President Harry Truman had called women’s rights ‘a lot of hooey.'\textsuperscript{17}

Under these conditions, then, it is not surprising that overall female representation in government was lacking, given the limited opportunities for success in the political arena. The women serving in national politics at this time were white women; women of color and, people of color generally, were mostly absent on the national stage. Writer Peggy Lamson, in her 1968 work on female politicians, succinctly described the reason for the reticence of women to become involved in politics: ‘‘...political and feminine are mutually exclusive. Politics by definition are aggressive. A woman seeking political office must therefore behave like a woman and not like a politician since aggressive women are of course not feminine. A woman who fights for her beliefs is shrill; a man is forceful.’\textsuperscript{18} Female politicians operated in a traditionally male sphere, and many chose to emphasize their femaleness as a result. Others such as Representative Frances Bolton, a Republican from Ohio, fought for equal treatment from her counterparts; for example, she insisted on being

\textsuperscript{16} Ronald Allen Goldberg, \textit{America in the Forties}, (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2012), 106.
\textsuperscript{17} Goldberg, \textit{America in the Forties}, 106.
called “Congressman,” not “Congresswoman.”

Congressman Bolton realized that not all female politicians shared her view, yet she was critical of those who emphasized their femininity. On other female lawmakers being called “Congresswoman,” she said, “They think they’re building up women that way. I say I do more for women than they do by being a woman Congressman,” arguing that being an effective female politician had far more to do with policy stances than nomenclature. Overall, the women who did take office during this time did so without a clear picture of what being a female politician looked like on a practical level.

Additionally, a woman’s road to political office was often the product of appointments and special elections. During Margaret Chase Smith’s first term in the House of Representatives, at which time she was her husband’s hand-selected successor, there were only seven females serving alongside her. By the time Smith entered the Senate of her own volition in 1949, only six women had gone into that chamber before her. Of the six, only one, Senator Gladys Pyle of South Dakota, was elected via special election with no ties to a husband. Four were appointed to fill their husband’s seats, and Senator Dixie Bibb Graves of Alabama was

19 Not coincidentally, she was one of Margaret Chase Smith’s closest friends in Washington, Janann Sherman, No Place for a Woman: A Life of Senator Margaret Chase Smith, (Piscataway: Rutgers University Press, 2000), 56; Lamson, Few are Chosen, 33.

20 Lamson, Few are Chosen, 33.

21 In addition to Smith, members were: Mary Norton (D-New Jersey), Caroline O’Day (D-New York), Edith Nourse Rogers (R-Massachusetts), Frances Bolton (R-Ohio), Jessie Sumner (R-Illinois), and Jeanette Rankin (R-Montana), Sherman, No Place for a Woman, 55.

22 Rebecca Latimer Felton (D-Georgia, 1922), Hattie Wyatt Carraway (D-Arkansas, 1931-45), Rose McConnell Long (D-Louisiana, 1936-37), Dixie Bibb Graves (D-Alabama, 1937-38), Gladys Pyle (R-South Dakota, 1938-39), and Vera Calahan Bushfield (R-South Dakota, 1948).
selected by her husband, Alabama Governor Bibb Graves, to fill a vacancy in 1937. By the Cold War era, there were more female Congressional members, but many had gone through the same processes as their predecessors to earn their seats. Through the examination of gender and political intersection in a burgeoning Cold War society, it becomes clear that Margaret Chase Smith's unique position as a woman in politics increased the significance of her remarks on June 1, 1950.

The Lady from Maine

Margaret Chase Smith once joked that as her husband's secretary in Congress, she was the product of nepotism. However, throughout her life, she was widely known as an intrepid crusader and hard worker, and someone who was respected on the merits of her ideas and the fierceness of her convictions. She was born on December 14, 1897, in her native Skowhegan, Maine. From the age of thirteen, Smith worked odd jobs, including a stint as a telephone operator in Skowhegan, where she met her future husband, Clyde Smith. Clyde, a local politician in Skowhegan, gave her a

24 More women would run in subsequent years for national seats, but until the mid-1960s, this demographic was almost exclusively limited to white women. When women of color did run and hold national office, they were still disproportionately underrepresented and disenfranchised as a whole.
26 Clyde, divorced, rumored womanizer, and twenty-one years Margaret's senior, would call in every night at a quarter to eight to inquire about the time. It was through these interactions that the two got to know one another, Patricia Ward Wallace, Politics of Conscience: A biography of Margaret Chase Smith (Westport: Praeger Publishers, 1995), 10.
part-time job recording tax assessments. Of this experience, Smith later said that she "learned a great deal about politics in those days." Married in May 1930, Smith followed Clyde to Washington after his election to the House of Representatives in 1936. In her husband's employ, Smith conducted research on timely legislative issues, and became knowledgeable on a range of topics, especially labor legislation. Clyde won reelection, but suffered a major heart attack in April 1940 that left him on his deathbed. In his final hours, he named his wife as his preferred political successor, and she took his place after a special election was held.

Margaret Chase Smith quickly earned a reputation in the House for her "plainspokenness, frankness, sincerity, independence, honesty, integrity, steadfastness, [and] courage." She was unafraid to vote outside party lines, which lead The New York Times to comment "She has a mind of her own and uses it...she's a party all by herself." Smith did not wish to use her gender to her advantage. Speaking during her later tenure as Senator, she said: "I've never asked for privileges as a woman, I never accept privileges as a woman, and I've never been given privileges as a woman."

---

28 Clyde originally had aspirations to run for the Maine governorship; bowing to party wishes, he ran instead for the House, Graham, Margaret Chase Smith, 27-28; Wallace, Politics of Conscience, 31.
29 Initially hesitant to accept the role, it was Clyde's physician, Georgian Dr. Paul F. Dickens, that convinced Margaret that she was the best fit to replace Clyde, Graham, Margaret Chase Smith, 29.
30 Sherman, No Place for a Woman, 51.
31 Ibid., 84.
accept my responsibilities, do my homework and carry myself as a member of the Senate—never as a woman member of the Senate.’”

During her first term in the House, Smith was assigned to the Education Committee. This was not random. Smith biographer Janann Sherman asserts that political leaders purposefully placed women on committees that encouraged a “sexual division of political labor” in issues such as health, childcare, and education, as those were thought to be women’s areas of expertise. Smith, whether she realized this strategy or not, spent minimal time on the committee. When the opportunity came, she sought another post, and ultimately ended up on the Naval Affairs Committee. During this time, America went to war in Europe, and Smith’s committee handled timely issues. After almost a decade in the House, she used her wartime Naval Affairs Committee experience to appeal to Maine voters in 1948 when she ran for the Senate. She beat a field of well-funded veteran politicians for

---

32 Although Smith did not consider herself a feminist and did not prefer to think of her gender as a component of her political decisions, it is nevertheless inextricably tied to the treatment she received while serving in government. Though somewhat limited in her role as a female Senator, there was a degree of privilege afforded Smith by virtue of her position as a middle-class white woman that others in her position might not have had, Lamson, Few are Chosen, 28-29.

33 During the first meeting of the Committee, all the men stood up when Smith entered, which men did as a sign of respect for women at the time. She hoped that they would come to regard her as a normal member, but this would take time. Said Smith of coping with implicit and explicit gender bias in her early political career: “I ignored any discrimination. I never, never acknowledged it. Never.” Sherman, No Place for a Woman, 55.

34 Ibid.

35 It was during this time she met and became good friends with Bill Lewis, who would later become her aide and help write the “Declaration of Conscience.”
the job, and in the process became the first woman to serve in both chambers of Congress. Her unflappable determination, prior legislative experience, and the subtle influence of existing gender stereotypes in her career lends perspective on Margaret Chase Smith’s persona and the impetus that compelled her to take a stand against McCarthy during her freshman term in the Senate.

“I would like to speak briefly...”

At the intersection of fear, gender, and McCarthyism lies the “Declaration of Conscience.” Smith biographer Gregory Gallant notes that the speech was given through “a desire to restore civility to the United States Senate” in light of recent attacks by McCarthy on the Senate floor. It is important to clarify that Margaret Chase Smith was not against the purge of potential Soviet spies from the United States government; she recognized the threat to national security that might accompany communist infiltration. She did not object to McCarthy’s general goal of purging communist spies, but rather to the coarse methods by which he pursued his often-unsubstantiated allegations and lack of proof presented when pressed. Once, before giving her speech, Smith asked to see papers that claimed to list communist spies that McCarthy had touted on the Senate floor. He responded with a defiant “‘Why? Don’t you believe me?’” When she expressed concern that McCarthy was not telling the truth, he gave her several copies that seemed to be legitimate, but Smith was unable to see “‘how they clearly proved his charges.’” At the time, Smith labeled her inability to understand as a mental “‘deficiency’ ” on her part, attributing it

to the fact that since she was not a lawyer like McCarthy, she might not be able to perceive the legal justifications of his argument. 39

As McCarthy's rhetoric became increasingly damaging to the credibility of the larger anti-communist mission within the government and to the sanity of the American people, Margaret Chase Smith became disillusioned by the witch hunt and felt compelled to take action; others considered her the best person to take on McCarthy. 40 She was solicited from March until May by those she termed "'earnest liberals'" to make a speech, chiefly by Ed Hart, member of the Senate Radio Correspondents' Gallery, and newspaper columnist Doris Fleeson. 41 Hesitant about writing a speech critical of the McCarthy machine, Smith's aide, Bill Lewis, encouraged her to send out an invitation for other Republicans to endorse the speech. 42 The final list was comprised of Republicans Charles Tobey of New Hampshire, George Aiken of Vermont, Wayne Morse of Oregon, Irving Ives of New York, Edward Thye of Minnesota, and Robert Hendrickson of New Jersey. 43 During Memorial Day weekend, Smith and Bill Lewis discussed strategy while driving to Maine, and the speech was drafted at her dining room table. 44

39 Implicit in claims of deficiency is a prevailing notion of a woman's limited capacity for understanding in traditional men's spheres, which would extend to national security and general political affairs, Ibid., 101.
40 There is a fringe theory that Smith's decision to speak out against McCarthy was partly motivated by her discontentment that McCarthy was not romantically interested in her. Almost all historians discard this theory wholesale, as it has no basis in fact, Walker, McCarthyism and the Red Scare, 46.
41 Wallace, Politics of Conscience, 102.
42 Ibid., 102.
43 Morse would later switch parties in his subsequent political career, but at the time of the speech, he was a Republican, Smith, Declaration of Conscience, 18.
44 Sherman, No Place for a Woman, 110.
The "Declaration of Conscience" was structured in such a way that grounded Smith's argument in her unique position as a Republican, woman, Senator, and American. The confluence of identities informed the speech as she issued a strong rebuke against sensationalism, smear, and incivility. As a Republican, Smith hoped to see her party overtake the Democratic majority, but not if it "embrac[ed] a philosophy that lack[ed] political integrity [and] intellectual honesty," a philosophy that Smith reasonably meant as one similar to McCarthy's tactics. In one short mention of her gender, Smith wondered aloud how women—specifically "mothers, wives, sisters and daughters"—felt about "the way in which members of their families have been politically mangled in Senate debate." As a Senator, Smith disapproved of "the way in which the Senate ha[d] been made a publicity platform for irresponsible sensationalism." Smith hoped, as an American, to see the "nation recapture the strength and unity it once had when [it] fought the enemy instead of [itself]." Margaret Chase Smith used each identity to call attention to what she perceived as problems in and out of the chamber and to advocate a more civil path forward.

The speech began by calling McCarthy's actions indicative of a larger "...national condition. A national feeling of fear and frustration that could result in national suicide and the end of everything that we Americans hold dear." These opening words highlighted the severity of McCarthy's rhetoric, placing it in the broader context of American Cold War hysteria. Smith then narrowed in on Senate actions, imploring all members to "do some real soul searching and weigh [their] consciences" about the ways in which they might be "using or abusing [their] individual powers and

45 Smith, Declaration of Conscience, 15.
46 Ibid., 16.
47 Ibid.
48 Ibid., 17.
49 Ibid., 12-13.
privileges." Criticizing those who "shout the loudest about Americanism," she stated to the Senate chamber that being an American should not mean being afraid to speak one's mind without fear of being labelled as "Communists" or "Fascists" by their opponents." Candidly, she condemned the Senate for advancing the fear in American society: "Today our country is being psychologically divided by the confusion and the suspicions that are bred in the United States Senate to spread like cancerous tentacles of 'know nothing, suspect everything' attitudes." She reminded her audience that while exposing Soviet spies within the government was a necessary act, it should not be conducted at the cost of "hate and character assassination sheltered by the shield of congressional immunity." In a thinly veiled attack on McCarthy, Smith eloquently stated: "It is strange that we can verbally attack anyone else without restraint and with full protection... surely we should be able to take the same kind of character attacks that we 'dish out' to outsiders."

Smith did not only target Joseph McCarthy and Senate practices, but also condemned the Democratic Truman administration and admonished her own party. She attacked the administration for its failure to "provide effective leadership," calling it complacent "to the threat of communism here at home and the leak of vital secrets to Russia." Smith declared that these missteps gave Republicans the chance to regain power in government. Yet, she did not want to see Republicans embrace McCarthy's lack of integrity and intellectual honesty in a potential victory; to do so would mean, as she said, to "ride to political victory on the Four Horsemen of

---

50 Ibid., 13-14.
51 Smith, Declaration of Conscience, 14.
52 Ibid., 15.
53 Ibid., 13.
54 Ibid.
55 Ibid., 15.
Calumny—Fear, Ignorance, Bigotry, and Smear.” Smith and her fellow signees advocated, among other things, a putting aside of political differences to focus on “thinking patriotically as Americans about national security based on individual freedom” instead of falling prey to “totalitarian techniques” that would play “directly into the Communist design of confuse, divide and conquer.” In this way, Smith squarely placed herself as a bipartisan who wished to see decency and civility restored to the Senate and America at large, having no qualms about lambasting colleagues and institutions that she found antithetical to her interpretation of American values.

America Reacts

Joseph McCarthy sat and listened to Margaret Chase Smith’s fifteen-minute speech, fully aware that he was the subject. When Smith finished, she expected that McCarthy would make a rebuttal, but he quietly slipped away from the chamber instead. In fact, the only responses came from Alexander Smith and Robert Hendrickson of New Jersey, Herbert Lehman of New York, and Millard Tydings. All the remarks praised her, but Tydings qualified his praise, knowing that Smith had also attacked his and other Democrats’ response to McCarthy. After she made her speech, she herself left the floor to travel to Florence, Italy, as part of a bipartisan group to attend the Fifth Session of the General Conference of UNESCO. Despite the relatively low profile the speech received the day it was given, reactions would continue in abundance in the coming days.

56 Ibid., 15-16.
57 Smith, Declaration of Conscience, 16-18.
58 Ibid., 18.
59 Ibid.
60 Ibid.
61 Sherman, No Place for a Woman, 111.
A bevy of mail arrived from across America in response to the speech, eight-to-one in Smith’s favor. 62 The Chicago Sun-Times declared that the speech contained “the ring of Lexington and Valley Forge, of the Gettysburg Address, of the American classroom, of the American home, the American Sunday school and the American church.” 63 For the most part, the media response was positive given the speech’s content. Smith’s home state newspapers were largely favorable. 64 Running the story on Friday, June 2, many news publications ran headlines on the first or second pages that simply alluded to the event: “7 Senate Republicans Assail ‘Smearing,’ Exploiting ‘Fear’ ” (The Washington Post), “GOP Senator Blisters Both Major Parties” (The Hartford Courant), and “MCCARTHY HIT IN SENATE” (The Boston Daily Globe). The New York Times ran a straightforward headline that read, “Seven G.O.P. Senators Decry ‘Smear’ Tactics of McCarthy.” 65 Beside the story was a picture of a stoic-looking Margaret Chase Smith.

Notably, like many of the stories that followed, the New York Times emphasized Smith’s gender, calling her the Senate’s “only woman member.” 66 Similarly, the sub-headline of that Friday’s Christian Science Monitor read “Mrs. Smith Leads ‘Bolt,’ ” and mentioned her voice in the chamber as being “low and emotion-charged” in rebuking McCarthy’s methods, subtly implying that since she was a woman,

62 Graham, Margaret Chase Smith, 77.
64 Sherman, No Place for a Woman, 112.
66 Ibid.
she might be prone to a hysterical outburst. Under a section titled “Democrats Chortle,” The Monitor did consider that Smith’s statement was an important one, not only due to the fact that it was essential to address the methods used to capture communists and to check the Democrats, but because it had “the inherent drama of the only woman member of the Senate appealing to the conscience of an all-male body.”

Even those publications that were supportive of the speech drew attention to Smith’s gender in one way or another, even though Smith’s speech only mentioned her gender as but a small facet of her argument.

Other publications treated Smith’s statement as a lecture, employing distinctly sexist overtones. Some ran headlines such as “Lady Senator Tongue-Lashes McCarthy & Co.” (New York News) and “Mrs. Smith, Only Woman Senator, Flays Republican Leadership” (Burlington Labor News, Iowa). The Albuquerque Journal’s headline read simply “Senators Lectured On Inquiry Tactics By Margaret Smith.” In a reprint of a Washington Post story, the Nebraska State Journal ran this headline: “‘Wanton’ Boys Chastened by Smith Speech.” In the story that followed,


68 Strout, “Eight Republican Senators Repudiate ‘McCarthyism.’”

69 Crouse, An American Stand, 27.


Doris Fleeson praised Smith’s “candor, honesty, and common sense,” saying that when Smith spoke, “a strong and cleaning wind seemed to blow thru the historic chamber.” Allusions to a woman’s duty were also made. The Senate was told to “keep its house clean,” while another portion of the story featured a veteran senator who “said he hadn’t felt so rebuked since he was in college and his mother took him to task for sowing some wild oats.” Though stories were intended to reflect positively on Smith, Fleeson and others took an angle that made Smith seem like a caricature of a stern schoolmarm instead of portraying her as a serious legislator addressing an important issue.

The most biting criticisms in the press of the speech, and of Smith more specifically, came from opinions and editorials from conservatives, who rebuked her as a foolish woman. From the Chicago Daily Tribune came accusations in the “Voice of the People” section that Republican senators were “Hiding Behind a Woman” and that “Mrs. Smith Should Apologize” for attacking McCarthy and fellow Americans without “know[ing] the facts.” The Atlanta Constitution published an opinion piece by journalist Westbrook Pegler that painted Smith’s criticisms as an indication that she “took advantage of the special privilege of her sex” in order to hurt her party and “attract undeserved pleasant attention to herself.” Another editorial in the Omaha Evening World

---

72 Fleeson was one of those who had originally persuaded Smith to make the speech in the first place, Ibid.
73 Ibid.
Elizabeth Campbell

*Herald* said that the “‘aggressive Soviet despotism’” that threatened America demanded more action than Smith’s “‘feather dusters.’”76 The *Saturday Evening Post* branded Smith “‘the Soft Underbelly of the Republican Party.’”77 Whatever their intentions, critics of Margaret Chase Smith’s speech played on gender norms and political ideology to discredit her.

The public and the media were quick to react to Smith’s remarks; yet her intended target, Joseph McCarthy, stayed noticeably silent. His only public remark, quoted in the *Washington Post*, made clear his plans to continue the fight against communism: “‘...this attempt to expose and neutralize those who are attempting to betray this country shall not stop regardless of what any individual or group in this Senate, or in the Administration, may do or say.’”78 Privately, McCarthy told friends that he would not respond to Smith’s charges because of her gender, saying “‘I don’t fight with women senators.’”79 He did, however, use a derogatory name among his friends for those who had signed the “Declaration of Conscience:” “Snow White and her Six Dwarfs.”80 In short, he had already decided that a female senator, no matter how authoritative, could not diminish his influence, and had thus disregarded her comments.

Elsewhere, Senate supporters praised Smith and the speech. Co-signer Irving Ives, quoted in the *Boston Sunday*

---

77 Sherman, *No Place for a Woman*, 112.
79 Sherman, *No Place for a Woman*, 111.
80 Sherman, *No Place for a Woman*, 111.
Globe, praised Smith for hitting "'a home run."' 

"She was the one person who could have said what she did without making the fur fly in the Senate ... because her colleagues respect her, believe she spoke from deep conviction and had no primary political motives." Others, such as co-signer Edward Thye, used the speech to implore the Republican party to develop a "'responsible' " response to the Red Scare that was "'destroying the Government." Whereas McCarthy responded by doubling down on his previous tactics, Smith's supporters wished to use the speech to change the way America prosecuted suspected communists. At any rate, responses to the "Declaration of Conscience" were varied and colorful, from effusive praise to unequivocal rejection. None of these comments, though, would stop McCarthy from instilling fear into the American public.

The Consequences of Speaking Up

Ultimately, mere words were not enough to curb Joseph McCarthy's divisive rhetoric and abrasive approach to his Soviet witch hunt. Margaret Chase Smith had chosen signatories to the "Declaration of Conscience" not only for their constituencies' varied geographical locations, but also for her confidence that they "shared her conviction about the danger of McCarthy's guilt-by-accusation technique." Before the end of June, though, four of the co-signers had publicly re-

82 "Ives Says Mrs. Smith 'Hit a Home Run' on Senator McCarthy."
versed their support. Whether they feared the ire of their constituents or the retaliation of McCarthy, Janann Sherman writes that the Senators who defected vehemently asserted that any endorsement of Smith’s statement should not be a reflection of their feelings toward McCarthy. Senator Ives, who had publicly supported Smith weeks earlier, now said that he was “in full sympathy with the attitude of the senator from Wisconsin” and praised him for his “constructive approach” to the communist problem. Senator Thye, who had called upon the Republicans to reach a consensus on the Red Scare issue, now said that McCarthy had “performed a service to his country and his state” through his actions. Senators Tobey and Hendrickson capitulated after McCarthy turned his ire on them; Senator Aiken distanced himself from Smith but remained friendly. Only Wayne Morse stayed committed to the statement. Historian David Oshinsky notes that, “Politically speaking, the Declaration had no real impact. For one thing, its focus was too narrow... For another, its sponsors were essentially a leaderless band.” In other words, the speech was effective rhetorically and as a piece of political posturing, but its supporters had no real plan of action to impede McCarthy’s conduct, even if the sentiments were sincere. This contributed to the ease in which the Declaration’s original supporters were able to escape a stauncher commitment to curbing McCarthy’s witch

---

85 Sherman, No Place for a Woman, 113-114.
86 Ibid., 114.
87 Ibid.
88 Ibid.
89 Two of Morse’s biographies, The Tiger in the Senate by A. Robert Smith and Wayne Morse: A Political Biography by Mason Drukman, mention Morse signing Smith’s “Declaration,” but woefully inadequate attention is paid. This perhaps alludes to the degree to which others believed the statement mattered in the grand scheme of things, Ibid.
hurt. After her male counterparts were flayed in public opinion, it was clear that, for the most part, Smith stood alone against McCarthy.

Margaret Chase Smith did not back down against McCarthy, but she did not escape her attack unscathed; she paid dearly for taking a stand against the Wisconsin Senator. True to his bully tactics, instead of taking Smith on directly as he would have done had she been a man, McCarthy stripped her of an important committee assignment in January 1951. Smith recounted how she learned she had been removed from the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee:

He did it by having a member of his staff deliver to my office, after 6 P.M. on the eve of the full committee meeting on subcommittee assignments, a copy of the memo which he had prepared for all Republican members with respect to subcommittee assignments. The door of my office was locked. McCarthy’s staff member put the letter under the door. However, I was in that office.91

Conscious of the fact that this was retribution for her speech, Smith tried to reverse the decision by going to the Chairman of the Executive Expenditures Committee.92 McCarthy was unflappable, claiming that her replacement, freshman Senator Richard Nixon, had more investigative experience than Smith as a former member of the House Un-American Activities Committee.93 Smith was outranked by McCarthy and thus unsuccessful. Not content to remove her from a committee, McCarthy sought to oust Smith from the Senate altogether. In 1954, McCarthy channeled support for Robert Jones in the Maine Senate primary, hoping that this time he could exact revenge on Smith, but she defeated Jones
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by a five-to-one margin. 94 Margaret Chase Smith was thus granted more time to continue her fight in the legislature.

Smith and the signers to the “Declaration of Conscience” were not the only senators to feel McCarthy’s wrath; bolstered by his increased power, McCarthy went after the very committee that tried to investigate him. Senator Millard Tydings, who had been investigating McCarthy and his claims, released the committee’s statement on July 17, 1950. Signed by all three Democrats on the Committee, it outlined the charges McCarthy had lodged against suspected communists and concluded that there was no evidence to pursue charges. 95 The statement called McCarthy’s tactics as “perhaps the most nefarious campaign of half-truths and untruths in the history of this republic.” 96 McCarthy publicly railed against the findings and argued that it even advanced communist interests. 97 It did not help that the report was only signed by Democrats; McCarthy spun this into a partisan attack rather than a legitimate issue. 98 In addition to lodging public criticism, McCarthy sought ultimate revenge by providing funding and consultants for Tydings’ opponents during the 1950 election. 99 Tydings lost, further cementing McCarthy’s image as an unstoppable force. 100 Until his official censure in December 1954, McCarthy would go on to
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perpetuate his harmful anti-Communist rhetoric largely unchecked.

Legacies: Margaret Chase Smith, the “Declaration of Conscience,” and the Cold War

The “Declaration of Conscience” catapulted Margaret Chase Smith’s name into celebrity. It made an adversary out of Joseph McCarthy. It is listed as one of the top one-hundred American speeches of the 20th century.\(^{101}\) Yet the speech and its contents failed to make a lasting impact on Red Scare discourse. Some, like Smith biographer Patricia Ward Wallace, credit the outbreak of the Korean War in late June 1950 with giving McCarthy an advantage over his critics as the conflict validated his crusade against communism.\(^{102}\) The fear already instilled in the American people continued unchecked by rational thinking and sensible legislation. The “Declaration of Conscience” receded into memory as a relic of judicious consideration.

Yet, fear is only one component of the speech’s failure to impact the broader conversation; gender is inextricably tied to its fate as well. Financier Bernard Baruch was quoted the day after the speech as saying, “If a man had made the Declaration of Conscience, he would be the next President of the United States.”\(^{103}\) Since Smith made the speech, critics

---

\(^{101}\) The list was compiled by researchers at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and Texas A&M University, reflecting the opinions of 137 leading scholars of the American public address. The speech itself is listed at #41, “Top 100 American speeches of the 20th century,” University of Wisconsin, https://news.wisc.edu/archive/misc/speeches/.
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discredited her according to prevailing gender perceptions. Even supporters could not help but emphasize her gender. In an era when to be a woman was to confine oneself to the domestic sphere, Margaret Chase Smith, who looked at gender as a component of politics but not its centerpiece, took a stand against what she perceived as a problem that she could help remedy. Not many other politicians could boast the same commitment to their convictions, before or after Smith’s time.

Margaret Chase Smith remained in the Senate for another twenty-three years until Bill Hathaway defeated her in 1972, staying true to her principles and voting her conscience until the end. In 1964, she ran for President of the United States. Announcing her candidacy among female company at the Women’s National Press Club on January 28, Smith noted that the odds were against her, including her gender. Yet she saw those “reasons advanced against [her] running as challenges.”

Harkening back to the summer of 1950, gender played a role in her presidential candidacy, with some calling her interest in military issues “‘Amazonian’” and wondering whether she would put “‘chintz in the oval office, perfume in the cabinet room, [and] colored ribbons on congressional bills.’” Nevertheless, Smith won over 26 percent of the vote in Illinois against Senator Barry Goldwater and held 27 votes at the Republican National Convention that summer. Until the day she permanently retired from politics, Margaret Chase Smith challenged conventional while simultaneously working within the system, and in the process provided other women the opportunity to do the same in both congressional and presidential bids.
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As a politician, Smith served the people of Maine for thirty-two years in the House and Senate. Those who came after her recognized the impact she had on their own political careers. Olympia Snowe followed in Smith’s footsteps, serving as Representative from Maine’s 2nd District, Smith’s constituency, from 1979-1995, and as Senator from 1995 until 2013. Upon Smith’s death in 1995 at the age of 97, Snowe paid tribute to Smith in the Senate chamber, praising her for her “courage, bravery, integrity, and pioneering spirit.”

Presently, Susan Collins is serving as Senator from Maine, having filled that seat since 1997, and there are more women serving in both houses of Congress than ever before. Just eight years after Smith’s groundbreaking run for President, Shirley Chisholm became the first black woman to seek the Presidency for herself in 1972. More recently, Hillary Clinton sought the nation’s highest public office in 2008 and again in 2016, becoming the first woman to earn the nomination of a major political party.

The Cold War-era gender stereotypes of Smith’s day are slowly being replaced, and a new, more politically-engaged, and more diverse generation of women is taking shape, in part because of the strides Smith and others have made in female political representation. The political landscape and legislative makeup have changed since Smith’s time in office, but much has remained the same. As elected women continue to make advances in politics in an age fraught with the tension and division reminiscent of the Cold War, they would do well to remember the legacy of Margaret Chase Smith: to speak and vote with their conscience, regardless of popularity or expediency, keeping the needs of the American people above their own.
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