While Arthur Miller was writing *The Crucible*, Senator Joseph McCarthy was conducting a campaign to root out communists in American public life. In his memoir, *Timebends*, Miller sees a connection between the Salem witch trials and McCarthy’s campaign. The following selections will help you understand that connection by providing you with information about McCarthyism and its bearing on *The Crucible*. They will also provide you with the opportunity to evaluate the objectivity of writers who have a personal stake in the subject they address. As you read, look for connections between the main idea expressed by these writers and the themes you studied as you read *The Crucible*.

**Standards Focus: Understand Historical Context**

To varying degrees, every literary work reflects its historical context—the social and political conditions that shaped the culture of its time. *The Crucible*, produced in 1953, grew out of the controversy surrounding Senator McCarthy and his anti-communism campaign. Political speeches on both sides of the issue often contained logical fallacies—rhetorical flaws that were intended to inflame public emotions. The most common of these are still prominent in this country’s political debates.

- The **either/or fallacy** insists that only two choices exist in a complex situation, as when a politician says, “You’re either with us or against us.”
- **Name-calling** occurs when politicians point the finger of blame, accusing their opponents of moral failings or lack of patriotism.
- When politicians lump all the members of an opposing group into a single negative **stereotype**, they have used **overgeneralization**.
- Finally, when a politician suggests that an opponent or an opponent’s policies are to blame for what’s wrong with the country, **false cause** is usually at work.

To better grasp the historical context of *The Crucible*, take notes on what you learn as you read the selections and evaluate the objectivity of each source. An objective source provides balanced information on a subject. The first selection is about McCarthyism. As you read it, try to determine whether the article takes a position on the subject. Each of the other selections was written by someone with a personal stake in the issue at hand. As you read, look for evidence of subjectivity—a personal stake in the subject that affects the writer’s stance.
Throughout the 1940s and 1950s America was overwhelmed with concerns about the threat of communism growing in Eastern Europe and China. Capitalizing on those concerns, a young Senator named Joseph McCarthy made a public accusation that more than two hundred "card-carrying" communists had infiltrated the United States government. Though eventually his accusations were proven to be untrue, and he was censured by the Senate for unbecoming conduct, his zealous campaigning ushered in one of the most repressive times in 20th-century American politics.

While the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) had been formed in 1938 as an anti-Communist organ, McCarthy's accusations heightened the political tensions of the times. Known as McCarthyism, the paranoid hunt for infiltrators was notoriously difficult on writers and entertainers, many of whom were labeled communist sympathizers and were unable to continue working. Some had their passports taken away, while others were jailed for refusing to give the names of other communists. The trials, which were well publicized, could often destroy a career with a single unsubstantiated accusation. Among those well-known artists accused of communist sympathies or called before the committee were Paul Robeson, Arthur Miller, Aaron Copland, Leonard Bernstein, Charlie Chaplin and Elia Kazan. In all, three hundred and twenty artists were blacklisted, and for many of them this meant the end of exceptional and promising careers.

During this time there were few in the press willing to stand up against McCarthy and the anti-Communist machine. Among those few were comedian Mort Sahl, and journalist Edward R. Murrow, whose strong criticisms of McCarthy are often cited as playing an important role in his eventual removal from power. By 1954, the fervor had died down and many actors and writers were able to return to work. Though relatively short, these proceedings remain one of the most shameful moments in modern U.S. history.
HISTORICAL CONTEXT
As you read this article, keep in mind that Victor Navasky is the author of Naming Names, a history of McCarthyism that depicts the subject in a dramatically negative light. His goal in this article is not simply to inform readers but to support his position on McCarthyism and The Crucible. As evidence Navasky cites logical fallacies in McCarthy’s political language (lines 5–6). Which logical fallacy does a speaker commit by calling his opponents spies and “comsymps”?

Arthur Miller prepares to testify before the House Un-American Activities Commitee, 1956.

The Demons of Salem, With Us Still
by Victor Navasky

When Arthur Miller’s drama The Crucible first opened on Broadway in 1953, the country was in a panic about the so-called Red Menace. Senator Joseph McCarthy, with his reckless charges of spies and “comsymps,” occupied the front pages, while behind the scenes J. Edgar Hoover, the director of the F.B.I., presided over and manipulated a vast internal security bureaucracy, issuing periodic bulletins intended to fan the flames of the domestic cold war.

In the center ring were the congressional inquisitor-investigators, asking “Are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?”

At the time, Mr. Miller and Tennessee Williams were regarded as the world’s two foremost playwrights. But that lofty status was an invitation rather than an obstacle to the red-hunters who wanted to talk to Mr. Miller. In fact, when he was finally summoned to appear, the committee chairman, Representative Francis Walters, let Mr. Miller know that things might go easier for him if he persuaded his fiancee, Marilyn Monroe, to pose for a photograph with the chairman. Mr. Miller let that option lapse and was shortly indicted for contempt of Congress when he refused to answer the committee’s questions about Communists he had known.

On the left, the hunt for subversives was routinely labeled a witch hunt, after the infamous Salem witch trials of the late 17th century. And so when The Crucible, set in Salem in 1692 but written in the overheated atmosphere of the domestic cold war, appeared, two questions were quickly asked: Was Mr. Miller’s depiction of the inhabitants and events of 1692 Salem faithful to the original? And was the original an appropriate metaphor for McCarthyism?

1. “comsymps”: Communist sympathizers.
On the historical front it was generally conceded when the play was written that Mr. Miller’s research was accurate. His principal changes involved fusing some characters and raising the age of John Proctor’s accuser, Abigail Williams, from 11 to 17 (to accommodate Mr. Miller’s story of how a liaison between Abigail and John was intertwined with the accusations of witchcraft against Proctor’s wife).

But even before the play was written, Mr. Miller was denounced for his metaphor. He had stopped off at the home of his friend and colleague Elia Kazan, who had directed Mr. Miller’s two previous prize-winning hits, “All My Sons” and “Death of a Salesman,” and who had been subpoenaed to appear before the House Committee on Un-American Activities (where he ultimately named names).

They went for a walk in the Connecticut woods and discussed Mr. Kazan’s dilemma. On the one hand to be an informer was unpalatable, but on the other, as Mr. Kazan put it at the time, “Secrecy serves the Communists.”

In his memoir Timebends, Mr. Miller wrote that he was half inside his car when Molly, Kazan’s wife, “came out and asked if I was staying at my house, half an hour away, and I said that I was on my way to Salem. She instantly understood what my destination meant, and her eyes widened in sudden apprehension and possible anger. ‘You’re not going to equate witches with this!’

Later, Mr. Kazan reported his wife’s views in his own memoir, A Life.

“What’s going on here and now is not to be compared with the witch trials of that time,” she said. “Those witches did not exist. Communists do. Here and everywhere in the world. It’s a false parallel. Witch hunt! The phrase would indicate that there are no Communists in government, none in the arts, none sending money from Hollywood to 12th Street.”

For me, the parallel worked. The term “Communist” had been so demonized that like the word “witch” it signified something that didn’t really exist in its popular meaning. Certainly the entertainment community was not conscious agents of an international monolithic conspiracy to overthrow the Government by force and violence; they were, for the most part, do-gooders, who thought—misguidedly, most of them later concluded—that the Communist Party was the best agency to do something about the depression and racism at home and fascism abroad.

As it turned out, despite mixed notices for The Crucible, over the years it was to become Arthur Miller’s most performed play, with productions in China, Poland, Britain, high schools and repertory theaters throughout the world. Now The Crucible is a $25 million motion picture, under the aegis of 20th Century Fox.

Although the playwright in Mr. Miller was originally drawn to think about the political and moral pressures of the domestic cold war years, when I asked him about the applicability of the play to the here and now he said:

“I have had immense confidence in the applicability of the play to almost any time, the reason being it’s dealing with a paranoid situation. But that situation doesn’t depend on any particular political or sociological development. I wrote it blind to the world. The enemy is within, and within stays within, and we can’t get out of within. It’s always on the edge of our minds that behind what we see is a nefarious plot.”
HISTORICAL CONTEXT

As you have seen by reading these selections, politics, journalism, and literature can share ideas from a particular historical context. One article provides information on the McCarthy hearings; another addresses both the hearings and the writing of *The Crucible*. The third provides personal testimony from Miller himself. To synthesize what you have read, identify a theme or idea that runs through all three selections.

I had known about the Salem witchcraft phenomenon since my American history class at Michigan, but it had remained in mind as one of those inexplicable mystifications of the long-dead past when people commonly believed that the spirit could leave the body, palpably and visibly. My mother might believe it still, if only in one corner of her mind, and I suspected that there were a lot of other people who, like me, were secretly open to suggestion. As though it had been ordained, a copy of Marion Starkey’s book *The Devil in Massachusetts* fell into my hands, and the bizarre story came back as I had recalled it, but this time in remarkably well-organized detail.

At first I rejected the idea of a play on the subject. My own rationality was too strong, I thought, to really allow me to capture this wildly irrational outbreak. A drama cannot merely describe an emotion, it has to become that emotion. But gradually, over weeks, a living connection between myself and Salem, and between Salem and Washington, was made in my mind—for whatever else they might be, I saw that the hearings in Washington were profoundly and even avowedly ritualistic. After all, in almost every case the Committee knew in advance what they wanted the witness to give them; the names of his comrades in the Party. The FBI had long since infiltrated the Party, and informers had long ago identified the participants in various meetings. The main point of the hearings, precisely as in seventeenth-century Salem, was that the accused make public confession, damn his confederates as well as his Devil master, and guarantee his sterling new allegiance by breaking disgusting old vows—whereupon he was let loose to rejoin the society of extremely decent people. In other words, the same spiritual nugget lay folded within both procedures—an act of contrition done not in solemn privacy but out in the public air. The Salem prosecution was actually on more solid legal ground since the defendant, if guilty of familiarity with the Unclean One, had broken a law against the practice of witchcraft, a civil as well as a religious offense; whereas the offender against HUAC (House Un-American Activities Committee) could not be accused of any such violation but only of a spiritual crime, subservience to a political enemy’s desires and ideology. He was summoned before the Committee to be called a bad name, but one that could destroy his career.
Comprehension

1. **Recall** What was Senator McCarthy’s mission?
2. **Recall** What kinds of professionals were targeted by McCarthy’s accusations?
3. **Recall** What was the catalyst for Miller’s interest in the Salem witch trials?

Text Analysis

4. **Evaluate Statements** Considering the historical context of *The Crucible* and Arthur Miller’s own comments in *Timebends*, do you think Miller was really “blind to the world” when he wrote *The Crucible*? Support your opinion.
5. **Evaluate the Role of Historical Context** Is knowing *The Crucible*’s historical context necessary to understand the playwright’s message? Explain.

Read for Information: Synthesize

**WRITING PROMPT**

Think about the social and political conditions of the time during which Arthur Miller was writing *The Crucible*. In what ways has looking through this historical lens colored your understanding of the play? In developing your new analysis, support your thesis with information from the articles you have just read and details from the play.

To answer this prompt, follow these steps:

1. In a sentence or two, summarize how reading these selections, evaluating their objectivity, and weighing the evidence they present has affected your understanding of the play and its historical context. Consider using this summary as your thesis statement.

2. In your notes, identify elements of the play that you now view differently. How has your sense of these elements changed? For example, are there things you now see more clearly? Does the play interest you more? Note the historical evidence that caused you to think differently.

3. Using your thesis statement and notes, write an essay in which you explain how the historical context of *The Crucible* affects your appreciation and understanding of the play.

4. Cite evidence from *The Crucible* and the selections in this Reading for Information feature.