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Introduction

This essay examines three cases of otherness: the Italian other in the 1920s, the Communist other during the Red Scare of the 1950s, and the Muslim other in post-2001. The similarities and differences of these cases will be analyzed through Richard Hofstadter’s analysis of the production of otherness for what he calls the paranoid style, Foucault’s analysis of power relations, and James Scott’s analysis of power relations and language. This essay will assess the theoretical methods behind “otherness” that Hofstadter, Foucault, and Scott use, the three cases of “otherness”, and the similarities and differences between the cases and how the theoretical mechanisms apply.

In this essay, “the other” refers to a group (be that group political, ethnic, racial, religious, or otherwise) that is socially, and in some cases politically, ostracized from the rest of a society, and “otherness” means the process by which “the other” is created and sustained. The cases chosen were intentionally diverse to demonstrate how broad the term of other can be, and is, applied, as well as to demonstrate that otherness is not a 21st century invention.

Richard Hofstadter and the Paranoid Style as a Tool for the Production of Otherness

Richard Hofstadter wrote on the subject of the style of paranoia used in American politics. His 1964 essay, titled The Paranoid Style in American Politics, discusses examples of certain individuals within the US population using what he calls the “paranoid style”\(^1\) to push an agenda, culminating with the modern (at the time) usage of the paranoid style by Sen. McCarthy.

\(^1\) Richard Hofstadter, The Paranoid Style in American Politics
However, to have this paranoid style present, there must be an other to be paranoid about.

Hofstadter’s analysis demonstrates how the other is produced: the paranoid convinces fellow Americans, turning the other into a symbolic evil.

To do this, he takes the paranoid view, claiming they feel “dispossessed: America has been largely taken away from them and their kind”\(^2\), and they must work to retake it. The paranoid finds and advocates conspiracy, and places guilt on the state either through inaction or direct collusion with the other. Because of this, the paranoid demands the state take action to combat the alleged threat the other poses. They also convince others by discussing “the fate of conspiracy in apocalyptic terms… the birth and death of whole worlds, whole political orders, whole systems of human values”\(^3\). By positioning himself as the last guard between the other and civilized, proper, decent life, the paranoid makes himself a paragon of virtue. Anything short of full success, even compromise, is failure. The paranoid wants to wipe the other from civil world; as the other is completely evil, they cannot exist. As the paranoid continues their assault on the other, the other becomes more than just a group of people: they become the embodiment of everything wrong. As people run into bad luck, begin responding to a message that tells them to blame all of their issues on one group of people.

**Foucault and the Propagation of Otherness**

Foucault’s *Discipline and Punish* covers how modern institutions have changed since the late 18th century; going from a spectacle and a demonstration of force to dissuade others from rebelling against that institution, to creating an internal system to readjust those who rebel while keeping the internal mechanisms out of the public eye. Modern institutions create fear of the unknown that acts as a greater deterrent to those interested in disobeying the system than a

\(^2\) Richard Hofstadter, *The Paranoid Style in American Politics*  
\(^3\) Richard Hofstadter, *The Paranoid Style in American Politics*
demonstration of force. In the former system of torture/punishment, the institution lays all cards on the table and openly brutalizes rebels, who violate institutional order and authority.

The book starts out by describing 1757 France, where a man accused of regicide was publicly and gruesomely tortured in front of a crowd. The man had to carry two pounds of burning wax to ensure the wax drips on him, before having horses pull apart at his limbs. This was public, drawing crowds of nobility and common folk. In this example, the State is the institution, the convicted man the rebel. The state, to punish the rebel, draws a public crowd which watches as the state destroys the rebel in a process that ensures the rebel will not be a problem while demonstrating the crowds what the state is capable of. In this way, the crowds are shocked into obedience by the institution.

The issue with this is that there were still rebels, and as institutions broadened, they lost members. Torture and punishment were based around eliminating threats, not improving and molding members. Thus, Foucault explains a new form of institutions dealing with rebels: discipline. Discipline systems to remove the public aspect of institutional punishments, and hide away rebels rather than expose them. Discipline also began focusing on reforming and molding the rebel, rather than eliminating them. This is done by analyzing their every move through a hierarchy, judging, and constant surveillance. Those who succeeded become proper members of the institution, and those who failed become delinquents.

Delinquents of state institutions are generally sent to prisons for rehabilitation, and removed from the public eye. Foucault makes it clear that this still falls under punishment, but a different type. Those condemned to prison must work off their insubordination under constant

---

4 Michel Foucault, citing the recount from the Gazette d’Amsterdam of April 1st, 1757 in Discipline and Punish (pgs. 3-6)
5 Michel Foucault, Discipline and Punish, Section 3: Discipline
6 Michel Foucault, Discipline and Punish, Section 3: Discipline
surveillance, in the hopes that they learn to not undermine the institutional authority. Those that succeed are “rehabilitated” and released into the institution, so it does not lose manpower. Those that fail fall into delinquency, and return to the penal system. The secrecy of this system introduces a new element: fear of the unknown. Those outside the walls of the penal system are unaware of what goes on within. In the old system, the institution bore all cards to the public as a deterrent. However, with added secrecy, people rely on hearsay of the horrors that occur.

Scott’s Hidden Transcripts and Ending the Propagation of Otherness

In understanding the fear of the other and how it relates, it is important to include an analysis of James C. Scott’s ideas of the hidden and public transcripts. Scott insists that power and language are strongly interrelated, and that language can be manipulated to achieve the goals of those in power through the use of the hidden and public transcripts. The public transcript is the interaction between those in power (the oppressors), and those not in power (the oppressed)\textsuperscript{7}, whereas the hidden transcript is the dialogue hidden from the oppressors.

Especially if the goal is to keep the oppressed away from normal political and social life for the well-being of the elites, many Americans would take issue with the public transcript. Realizing this, those in power adopted a hidden transcript to push their goals with public support. Scott makes the claim that, with these power relations, “the more menacing the power, the thicker the mask”\textsuperscript{8}. By this, he means the more oppressors want to do to the oppressed, the more the oppressors want to exert will and force, the more this want must be masked and justified. If the want is the hidden transcript, then the justification given to the public is the public transcript.

The public/hidden transcript does not apply solely to those in power. As Scott argues, both the oppressors and the oppressed use this strategy of hiding personal motives to remain

\textsuperscript{7} Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts
\textsuperscript{8} Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts, Chapter 1: Behind the Official Story
justifiable in the public eye\(^9\). As it relates to the oppressed, the public transcript is more docile, accepting the demands of the oppressors. This allows those not within the group of the other to believe that there is consent; however, such a position is just an act to elude suspicions. The idea is that if the oppressed consent, they are acting in a manner that benefits the institution. The oppressed, then, have more freedom to plan their moves against the oppressors.

The displays of the public transcript include putting on an elegant display of uniformity. If the oppressors are seen as a uniform group, there is implied power and strength which demonstrates the power that the oppressors have over both the average citizen and the oppressed\(^10\). Such a display helps the public transcript by reminding everyone of the power held by the oppressors. This can also make the average citizen feel like they are a part of the parade, and a part of the power. It feels inclusive, and makes them feel, to some degree, involved and safer. If the average citizen is part of the “us”, there is a sense of inclusion. It helps make people feel that those not “us”, in some way, the “them”, are wrong somehow.

If the oppressors succeed at separating the hidden and the public transcripts, then it would be logical to believe domination and the oppressors fail when the hidden transcript is publicized. Scott explores this, citing the 1989 rally for President Nicolae Ceausescu in Bucharest\(^11\). Such an action is, of course, dangerous; the oppressors have power. However, if successful, publicizing the hidden transcript can weaken the power by undermining faith in the oppressor. Revealing the hidden transcript makes the public feel lied to and outraged\(^12\). It justifies a more open rebellion against the oppressors. In Scott’s example, the people were watching the rally,

---

\(^9\) Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts
\(^10\) Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts, Chapter 3: The Public Transcript as a Respectable Performance
\(^12\) Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts, Chapter 8: A Saturnalia of Power: The First Public Declaration of the Hidden Transcript
and heard booing before it was dubbed over by applause. In the few moments of booing, they saw a group dissenting, but when the booing was covered up by applause, they saw the power of the institution manipulating the live feed to fit their purposes. This means that the institution is willing to manipulate circumstances and facts to demonstrate a more unified opinion, and begs further questions: Was this done before? How long has this been going on? What else is the state lying about? Such questions undermine the authority of the institution, and make the people question what was previously seen as factual. While risky, such a move can completely undermine institutional power and start a line of questioning leading to a rejection of their power.

The use of the public and hidden transcripts of course goes both ways; they are manipulations of language to suit the needs of a group. The dominators use the public transcript to make the average citizen feel protected, safer, and happier because of their presence. To fight this manipulation of language, the hidden transcript must become public.

The Italian Other (1890s-World War 2)

An example of the other in American politics is the Italian other. Prior to mass Italian immigration, there was a small group of Italians in the United States who were generally considered respectable. They were renowned craftsmen and musicians, forming up the original core of the Marine Band. By 1870, there were around 25,000 Italian immigrants in the US, most came from Northern Italy before the years and struggles of Italian unification.

This view of Italian immigration changed radically between 1870 and 1920, however, as millions of Italians immigrated to the United States. These Italians were vastly different from the previous Italians; the Italians that were in the United States were Northern Italians, generally trained, skilled individuals looking to expand into new markets in the New World. These new

---

13 Library of Congress Italian immigration presentation, describing early Italian immigration into the US
14 PBS Destination America, describing the Italian immigration to the US
Italian immigrants were mostly Southern Italian, poor, and untrained agricultural laborers. They came to United States for various reasons: Atlantic travel had become significantly cheaper, political instability of a recently-unified government, violence in Italy, diseases and natural disasters that the new government was unprepared to assist the people in recovery from, and little upward socioeconomic mobility are some reasons. While some Italians worked in the US to bring some money back to Italy, many stayed and became permanent residents.

However, the American response to such an uptick in Italian immigration was not positive. Many Americans disliked the Italian immigrants, considering them lesser people. In the 1890s, for example, many Italians in America were lynched by angry mobs. The worst attack on Italians came from New Orleans in 1891. New Orleans Police Chief David Hennessey wound up supporting a political faction in opposition to Italian immigrants, creating problems for him in New Orleans. Ultimately, Hennessey was murdered, supposedly by people he called dagoes. In a response by the police, over 100 Sicilians were rounded up, 19 were arrested, the case became known as the “Who Killa Da Chief?” scandal, and the newspapers had already claimed the Italians guilty. When the Italians arrested were acquitted of murder due to lack of evidence, though they still had other outstanding charges against them, people were shocked, and the next day, a mob of 10,000 people formed claiming the Sicilian mafia bribed/intimidated the jurors, and deserved justice. On March 14th, the mob stormed the prison, and eleven Italians were lynched in the largest single mass lynching in US history. The New York Times called

---

15 Library of Congress article about Italian immigration
16 Library of Congress article, discussing the attacks on Italians
17 KnowLouisiana.org article on the Sicilian lynchings
18 “Dago” was generally used in the time period as a slur for Italians, or more generally, those of Mediterranean descent. It was a shortened version of the name “Diego”. Dagoes, of course, being the plural of this.
19 Library of Congress article outlining the New Orleans lynching
20 KnowLouisians.org article
the Italians “murderers” in the subtitle of their article on the lynch mob\textsuperscript{21}. Theodore Roosevelt, not yet president then, referred to the lynching as “a rather good thing”\textsuperscript{22, 23}. The event led to a temporary suspension of diplomatic relations between Italy and the US\textsuperscript{24}, but the people of the United States held generally positive opinions. The Italians, in the eyes of the American public, were tied to the mafia, and deserved their fate. The lynching was justice for the murder.

Such an incident of active violence against the Italian other is not a lone incident. In total, around 50 lynchings of Italians were reported between 1890 and 1920\textsuperscript{25}, including a lynching in Tallulah, Louisiana. All five Italians living there were lynched in 1899, apparently “after a disagreement over a goat”\textsuperscript{26}. The Italian government asked for monetary reparations for the families of the murdered, and for the lynchers to be tried. While the federal government could agree to monetary compensation, the trial would be an issue left to Louisiana, which was not inclined to prosecute. President Harrison attempted to fix this, but Congress took no action.

But lynchings were not the only issue Italians in America faced. Italians were also subject to poor living and working conditions\textsuperscript{27}. Italians had to live in tenements due to lack of funds and discrimination in the housing markets\textsuperscript{28}. They were cramped, crowded, poorly lit, and miserable\textsuperscript{29}. And the options that most Italians had for work was unsavory at the best of times; due to their lack of skills, they were often seen as violent, brutish, apelike, and only really suited for degrading menial labor or street performance with an organ grinder\textsuperscript{30}.

\textsuperscript{21} New York Times article on the anti-Italian mob lynching
\textsuperscript{22} CNN article by Ed Falco, “When Italian Immigrants were the Other”
\textsuperscript{23} The American magazine article “A Rather Good Thing”
\textsuperscript{24} Chicago Tribune article outlining the Tallulah lynching, and mentioning the New Orleans lynching affair
\textsuperscript{25} Public Radio International article on Italians in America
\textsuperscript{26} Chicago Tribune article outlining the Tallulah lynching
\textsuperscript{27} Library of Congress article on Italian immigrants, focusing on working and living environments
\textsuperscript{28} Public Radio International article on Italians in America
\textsuperscript{29} Appendix E has an image of an Italian immigrant and her daughter working from the tenement
\textsuperscript{30} See Appendix D for political cartoons describing and depicting Italian immigrants
In the late 1910s through the mid 1920s, Congress issued legislation to reform immigration. This legislative push began in 1917, with legislative requirements that immigrants pass a literacy test that required those 16 and up to demonstrate a basic reading comprehension. However, in 1921, Congress issued the Emergency Quota Law, also known as “An Act To limit the immigration of aliens into the United States”. The legislation placed immigration quotas at “3 per centum” of immigrants in the US during the 1910 census “in any fiscal year”. In 1924, there was a strong debate in Congress a more permanent policy. The idea of a quota was so effective at curtailing immigration that the question was not if the quotas worked, but rather, how the quotas could be more restrictive. The ultimate decision in 1924 was to restrict immigration to just 2% based on 1890 census data. The data also extended the percentages back, including those born to foreign ancestors. This allowed for more Anglo-Saxons, but restricted others.

World War 2 also saw a fear of the Italian other. FDR, after Pearl Harbor, issued proclamation 2525, 2526, and 2527 to round up Americans with ancestral ties to the Axis nations (Italians with 2527), and intern them in internment camps. Not only was this done to US citizens, the US requested that Latin-American countries also send their immigrants to the US for internment. Many interned were repatriated back to their country of origin, or released on parole. In total, over 30,000 individuals were interned, due to a fear of the Axis others during WW2. The fear was that these people would hold ties to their country of origin, which could compromise the American cause.

31 Website for the Office of the Historian
32 An Act To limit the immigration of aliens into the United States official text
33 Website for the Office of the Historian
34 Archives.gov article on the WW2 Enemy Alien Control Program
35 FOI Proclamation 2527
36 Archives.gov article on the WW2 Enemy Alien Control Program
With an understanding of the history of the Italian other, it is necessary to explain and analyze the otherness. There are some questions that must be answered: who is behind the Italian other, through what methods, did it end and if so how, and how do Hofstadter’s, Foucault’s, and Scott’s analyses fit in?

The first question must be answered by returning to the incidents in late 19th century Louisiana. In returning to this situation, there is a power struggle between the Democrats who had overthrown Reconstruction-era Republicans. There was The Ring, with many Italians, and the Reform Democrats\textsuperscript{37}. Hennessey and those in power in New Orleans at the time were with the Reform Democrats, which put them at odds with the Italian immigrants. The Italians in New Orleans were seen as being in the mafia, which the media helped to perpetuate. The trials of Hennessey’s murder finding them not guilty fueled those flames. The media helped to justify this anger as well, as many sources either outright claimed or implied that the Italians were guilty and the mafia was covering it up. This caused the American people to feel their government was infiltrated by Italians, and as such, they needed to take it back. They stormed the prison and lynched the Italians. The opposing political faction saw the Italians gaining power, and wanted to bring them down. The media helped this by publishing biased accounts of the issue nationally, making Americans all across the nation a little more afraid of the Italian other. This fear of the Italian other led many people, including future President Theodore Roosevelt, to praise what happened. Political elites already opposed the Italians; they were getting more involved in local politics. The media helped spread this fear throughout the nation, to the common citizens.

It is difficult to claim that the fear of the Italian other is over. The unique aspect of this case is that, though the fear of the Italian other has certainly helped lead to the state legislating

\textsuperscript{37} KnowLouisiana.org article on the Sicilian lynchings
against the Italian other, there are few federal situations where it is clearly and solely the Italian other discriminated against. With Muslims, the Iraq War and the Trump travel ban make solid cases; in the case of the Communist other, HUAC is a strong example. However, with the Italian other, no such case exists. The immigration restrictions targets Italians, but it also targets most European nations and all Asian nations. The internment camps also targeted Italians, but they targeted the rest of the Axis powers too. There is no single case where it can be argued that the Italian other was the sole target of political legislation. And these cases can be the most dangerous. The fear of the Italian other is never as prominent as other examples, and because of this, people often marginalize or doubt its existence. If people doubt the existence of it, it becomes difficult to end. Even today we see ties between Italians and the mafia; The Sopranos, a popular TV show about a mafia family, just ended in 2007\(^{38}\). Regarding Italians as morons, Jersey Shore painted Italians as egotistical morons who are driven by emotion and hormones, not by reason\(^{39}\). The media still portrays Italians as the other, but because there’s never been a large-scale attack on just Italians, it is marginalized, ignored, or forgotten.

Hofstadter’s arguments of the paranoid style inform the production of otherness. As Hofstadter argues, the paranoid feels that his way of life is being lost in a changing nation. The Italian immigrants represent the change, and the established Americans of the New Orleans mob are a great example of the paranoids. The mob of people and those who sanctioned it felt that government had let them down through inaction, as the perceived undermining of democracy by the Sicilian mafia caused guilty Italians to walk. The paranoids labelled these new Italians as the problem, with their connections to crime, and demanded that something be done. They lynched the Italians in prison because they felt that the law had failed them, and they would not have had

\(^{38}\) HBO The Sopranos
\(^{39}\) IMDb Jersey Shore
to resort to this had the law taken proper action beforehand. This immediate blame on Italians is the paranoid style Hofstadter discusses. This is the production of the Italian other.

Foucault’s analysis of delinquents and delinquency within institutions informs the propagation of the Italian other. If being Italian is delinquency, Italians would be delinquents and government the institution. The institution needs to mold the most people it can, reforming them into proper working cogs in the machine of the institution. The media, the propaganda wing of the institution, reaffirms the Italian delinquency by comparing them to apes, criminals, and otherwise lesser individuals despite no real statistical basis for criminality in Italians. The cure is to assimilate into American society proper. Those who fail, then, are punished and reformed: immigration quotas prevent these people from initially entering, and the trials and prisons Italians are thrown into are to teach them to properly assimilate. By insisting that Italians are delinquents, the idea is that the Italians would assimilate and become proper workers.

Scott’s understanding of the hidden and public transcripts is also relevant to this understanding of the Italian other. Both the the oppressed Italian other and the the oppressors of the government are fighting to keep their hidden transcripts hidden and their public transcripts accepted by the neutrals. It seems the best argument of a public versus a hidden transcript is the association of Italians with criminality. Despite there not being evidence for this claim, Italians are often tied to the mafia. Though this can be proven untrue with sufficient research, this alone does not mean that the hidden transcript has become public. Generally, with a hidden transcript becoming public, there is a large, open view of the oppressors changing the transcript, an example everyone can easily see. For the Muslim other, this is false pretenses to enter Iraq. For the Communist other, the Army-McCarthy Trials. This has yet to happen with the Italian other;

---

40 FBI information about Italian crimes
the hidden transcript of the oppressor has stayed hidden. For the Italian other to be resolved, the hidden transcript must be publicized.

Ultimately, there is a long history of the Italian other that perpetuates to this day. The fact that this continues is partly due to the lack of a hidden transcript becoming public in one massive publicized event. Another reasoning is there has yet to be a large-scale attack specifically on Italians; the attacks on Italians are always wrapped up in other, more broad issues: the Catholic other, the immigrant other, or the Axis other. Due to this, the state can continue to reform the Italian other, as the Italian other is still a delinquent and being Italian still delinquency.

**The Red Scare and the Communist Other (1918-1950s)**

A different other in American history has been created through ideology. Due to hostility with Russia during the Cold War era, reactionaries like Sen. Joe McCarthy began to label the far left, specifically communists, as the “other”. While this happened mostly in the mid-20th century, leftist ideas are just now making it back into the American political mainstream. One of Sen. Sanders’s biggest issues was that he was perceived as a “socialist”, and therefore, a radical—even though socialism is a broad spectrum of views, of which Communism is only a small part. True communistic publications are still rarely published in the US today.

Take the example of Maine’s *The Bollard*, offered for free in the back of the waiting room of a Biddeford, Maine restaurant. The February 2017 paper features an article about the “Cooperative Manifesto”, an idea the authors claim is Marxist in nature. Opinions like these are not published in reputable, widely-spread papers like the New York Times. Such opinions are deemed “too extreme” for the American public. This article refers to buzzwords like “the
cooperative revolution”\textsuperscript{41}, and has themes paralleling Karl Marx’s \textit{The Communist Manifesto}. To sell communistic ideas to the American people, they cannot be outright stated; they must be wrapped in new terms that must be defined as not communism. To gain credibility for these ideas, the article had to spend a paragraph trashing the idea of communism, referring to it as “guys with bushy eyebrows in gray suits telling everyone what they can and cannot do”\textsuperscript{42}. The author of this article, in order to make the points, had to distance these ideas from communism, as though communism is a plague. This attitude is common in the American public sphere.

As for the source itself, it is not a major news source. The Bollard went further in their willingness to print such an article than most major news sources would, though it is unwilling to call itself communist or even leftist, instead referring to itself as “Maine’s independent voice for local news and arts coverage”\textsuperscript{43}. The name of the paper and their online description do not mention communism. To willingly adopt the label of communist is rare; many often relegate those publications to the sidelines. Of the few publications currently in print, most either refuse to define themselves, or define themselves as “a voice for progressive change”\textsuperscript{44}, or advocating for “workers and oppressed peoples”\textsuperscript{45}. Few even list themselves as advocating revolution, believing this association preferable to communism\textsuperscript{46}. Why is communism so despised that those who publish articles for it would rather advocate revolution than communism?

The United States government was concerned about the impacts of German propaganda towards the end of WWI in 1918. Sen. Lee Overman, responding to this concern, launched the Overman Committee and began investigating the influence of German propaganda. Initially, the

\textsuperscript{41} The Bollard, The Cooperative Manifesto
\textsuperscript{42} The Cooperative Manifesto, referring to communism
\textsuperscript{43} The Bollard
\textsuperscript{44} People’s World online paper
\textsuperscript{45} Worker’s World online paper
\textsuperscript{46} Wikipedia list of American communist periodicals
Overman Committee condemned the brewing industry for being “unpatriotic, because it has been pro-German… these great brewery organizations owned by rich men, almost all of them are of German birth… [who finance organizations that teach German immigrants] to remember, first, the fatherland, and second, America”\textsuperscript{47}, and investigated brewers for German sympathies. The initial intent was to ensure that brewers were not trying to aid Germany during WWI.

However, as the Bolshevik Revolution swept through Russia, the US Senate voted in 1919 to expand the Overman Committee’s role to investigating communism to protect American capitalism from communist revolutions in the United States\textsuperscript{48}. The senators of the committee expressed fears that influencers like Russia and Germany were planning an “overthrow of our republican government” to replace it with a communist government\textsuperscript{49}. The goal changed from ensuring no American was aiding an enemy in times of war to preemptively investigating a new, different ideology as a threat to the established American way of life. This was a fundamental shift in the committee, and politically started the American fear of the communist other, also considered the Red Scare.

After more temporary committees, and revolutions across Europe and Asia, the American people grew increasingly wary of foreign ideology and influences, notably Nazi Germany. In 1934, the House of Representatives launched the McCormack-Dickstein Committee, officially called the US House of Representatives Special Committee on Un-American Activities Authorized to Investigate Nazi Propaganda and Certain Other Propaganda Activities, which allowed the Speaker of the House “to appoint a special committee to be composed of seven Members for the purpose of conducting an investigation of (1) the extent, character, and objects

\textsuperscript{47} US Senate Committee on Brewing and Liquor Interests and German Propaganda; AKA The Overman Committee, Volume 1
\textsuperscript{48} North Carolina Natural and Cultural Resources
\textsuperscript{49} US Senate Committee on Brewing and Liquor Interests and German Propaganda; AKA The Overman Committee, Volume 2
of Nazi propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation”\(^50\). While the intent of the committee was to examine primarily Nazi propaganda, it included language communism. In the committee’s formation, legislators claimed “[i]n Europe… governmental systems that sought to guarantee the rights and liberties of citizens were overthrown and either Communism or Fascism was installed. In either instance… despotism supplanted freedom… and the rights and liberties of the people vanished”\(^51\). Despite the committee’s name calling out Nazism, much of the legislative wording involved attacks on Communism.

This became anti-Communist leanings in the post-WWII era, with the US and the USSR engaged in the Cold War. In the 1950s, Sen. Joe McCarthy was elected, and began campaigning against communism in a smear campaign that became known as McCarthyism\(^52\). In 1950, he claimed there were communists employed in the Department of State\(^53\). This claim came at a time in which China’s Communist Revolution was winning, and the USSR was the global superpower opposite the US. Due to the concerns about the spread of global communism, the thought of Communists infiltrating the US government terrified many Americans. The more permanent House Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC) was in full swing and investigating government employees, singers, actors, and media executives alike. HUAC

\(^{50}\) National Archives Catalog U.S. House of Representatives. Special Committee on Un-American Activities Authorized to Investigate Nazi Propaganda and Certain Other Propaganda Activities Organizational Authority Record
\(^{51}\) National Archives Catalog U.S. House of Representatives. Special Committee on Un-American Activities Authorized to Investigate Nazi Propaganda and Certain Other Propaganda Activities Organizational Authority Record, as it references Communism
\(^{52}\) American Heritage Dictionary definition of McCarthyism
\(^{53}\) US Senate: “Have you no Sense of Decency?”
classified witnesses as either being “friendly” or “unfriendly” to the intentions of the HUAC\textsuperscript{54}, and asked questions accordingly. With the witnesses that the HUAC deemed as “friendly”, the questions generally seemed fewer, more lighthearted, and more based on finding out information on new leads. Ronald Reagan’s transcript, for example, points to a search for new leads\textsuperscript{55}. The “friendly” transcripts were also generally short, with an average of around 8 pages as opposed to 88.2 pages, on average, for those deemed “unfriendly”. Those that were “unfriendly”, often charged in violation of the Smith Act of 1940 and/or the Hatch Act of 1939\textsuperscript{56} (which were used to fight forces deemed to be “subversive” to the US government), were questioned more harshly. Singer Pete Seeger, for example, was in contempt of HUAC and refused to answer any questions asked of him on violation of the 1st amendment\textsuperscript{57}. The questions in these hearings seemed directed at getting the witness to implicate himself/herself or someone else. If implicated in these hearings, it was a black mark, and it got witnesses blacklisted in Hollywood where many worked. As such, many actors/playwrights/producers outed as Communists were unable to convey their message to a larger audience.

McCarthyism came to an end in the mid-1950s. Sen. McCarthy claimed the US Army harbored Communists, and the army retorted by claiming he wanted special treatment for an aide that had been drafted\textsuperscript{58}. During this time, McCarthy stepped down from his leadership position for the Army-McCarthy Hearings. The hearings damaged his name and political career by making McCarthy a bully and fool. McCarthy, at one point, tried to charge one of the army’s attorneys with having ties to Communism, and Welch (the army’s prosecutor) eventually asked him “At long last, have you no sense of decency?”. These remarks, along with many other
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remarks said by and to Sen. McCarthy, led to his censure in the US Senate. With this, the House Committee on Un-American Activities dropped much of the open anti-Communism, and changed to the House Committee on Internal Security in 1969 before being abolished in 1975. The fear of Communism largely dissipated by the 1990s as the USSR collapsed, Germany re-unified, and global ideologies straightened out among the world's superpowers. The Communists were a political “other”: they were ostracized both socially and politically for most of the 20th century. Today, to a lesser extent, the impacts are still felt.

The who behind the Communist other seems simple: American politicians, at least politically, made these people the other. And this political ostracizing led to the ostracizing in social groups. However, the issue is not that simple. In the United States, legislators are elected by the general public, and are responsible to them. Also, this would ignore how McCarthy won and prospered. He beat a sitting US Senator, successfully re-elected with the Red Scare, and had a surge of support as he fought the anti-Communist fight, meaning there was a social pressure that helped feed the political pressure. The Communist other in the United States has roots in the American perception of the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917, with the change in the Overman Committee’s purpose. It seems there was an initial scare of those in power who felt threatened by the overthrow of the state; as such, they might be prone to a swift political response. Mix this with the seeming economic success of the 1920’s and the American people would have likely felt comfortable with capitalism while political actors worked behind the scenes to keep Communists down. The media helped, intentionally or not, with this. The political unrest in Europe helped drive a fear of political change. And if that’s the only information Americans get from abroad, people would likely be concerned for their well-being.

For example, the McCormick-Dickstein Committee described banning Communist propaganda.
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and investigating Communism to be protecting the United States, and those within. This logic perpetuates the social ostracizing of Communists, and begins a cycle: an opportunistic politician capitalizes on the social fear of the other, turning it into an active, upfront political fear again, which fans the flames of the social fear even more.

If the fear of the other is produced and propagated behind closed doors, perhaps it can be eliminated by exposing it in the open. And this is exactly what happened. Once the propagator of the Communist other got a face and a name in Sen. McCarthy, the opposition to this fear only had to drag him into the spotlight and make him justify and defend himself. When the US Army dragged Sen. McCarthy into the spotlight by bringing charges against him and televising the hearings, McCarthy went from a decorated war hero and great American patriot to a liar, a bully, and a pathetic person. It had come out that he had lied about some of his wartime experiences, and his moral character was called into question in the hearings. He became a national embarrassment, and was censured. He became ostracized from American social and political life. By bringing McCarthy into the open, instead of letting him hide in the nebulous haze of the fear of the other, his methods were exposed as crass, rude, dishonest, and just plain wrong. This is where the fear of the Communist other began to decline in popularity, because it started to become associated with McCarthy and McCarthyism. By McCarthy taking it too far and getting exposed, he began the decline in the fear of the Communist other.

Hofstadter’s paranoid style can be applied to the Communist other to describe its production. For the Communist other, the paranoids were those who allowed the Overman Committee and the Committees that followed to investigate Communism. These people utilized
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the paranoid style Hofstadter discusses, describing Communistic influences as all kinds of vile and wrong. They maintained Communism as pure, root evil, characteristic of the paranoid style. This paranoid style, painting of Communism as pure evil that is unsafe for good Americans, produced the Communist other.

Foucault’s analysis of the delinquent and delinquency informs the propagation of the Communist other. The institution wants ideal workers who do not deviate from a standard. If the institution is the state, those at the top levels would be wary of threats to the status quo. If the Communist other is a threat to the status quo that has allowed those at the top to get there, it makes sense that they would want to prevent the Communist other from causing change. They consistently tried to hide those suspected of being different, the delinquents. In the case of the Communist other, the institution did this by bringing the delinquents to testify in front of a committee. If found guilty, these delinquents would be arrested or otherwise disciplined, being kept out of the public eye. This gave other potential delinquents the fear of the unknown, which would prevent them from actually being delinquents. At least, it would help the delinquents feel the need to hide their delinquency, making them too timid to act as a threat. In this way, the delinquents would be molded to fit the needs of the institution, which needs a status quo.

Scott’s hidden transcript does not seem to have a strong connection present: most language about the Communist other being discriminated against is public. However, a deeper analysis reveals some hiddenness of the transcript. For example, much of the legislation is argued to be in the benefits of public safety\textsuperscript{63}, or kept within the confines of the Committee
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Hearings\textsuperscript{64}, which were not public affairs and avoided due to an unwillingness to be associated. The idea that this was done in the name of “public safety” is an example of the hidden transcript: an inaccurate reason to justify the actions taken, that most people feel justifies the action. In the sense of hiding behind public safety, and in hiding the true sentiments in legal documents that are rarely read by the general public, there is a transcript that is public in name alone. Another aspect that keeps the transcript hidden is the supposed neutrality of the Committees. Many of the Committees, even if they prosecute Communists, are created to stop subversive propaganda. In their creation, they often include references to Fascism, making them appear as ideologically neutral. Even if the Committees in practice primarily express a fear of Communism, the language backing their creation implies a concern of any threatening ideology.

The Communist other was formed by those in favor of the status quo. This group, predominantly elites who stood to benefit from the status quo, quietly began to ostracize the Communist other in political circles by slowly utilizing already-present infrastructure and reasons to keep Communism down. The media, either intentionally or not, helped the elites with this by giving continuous updates of political instability abroad. This political instability helped spread fears of the Communist other in social circles. As social fear of Communism grew, politicians capitalized on it to get elected. This gave the fear of the other a face, and allowed the opponents a target to drag into the open. By dragging this face out into the open and making him out to be a fool, the fear began declining in the political and social spheres.

\textbf{The Muslim Other in Post-9/11 America}

A contemporary example of otherness in the United States is the Muslim other in post-9/11 America. Muslim is often equated to terrorist, someone using violence and threats to
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intimidate or coerce to influence politics. Under this definition, there can be all kinds of terrorists, but the term often implies Muslims.

On September 11th, 2001, the American opinion of Muslims changed. 19 Muslims with affiliations to Al-Qaeda hijacked four US commercial airplanes, and attempted to fly them into prominent American buildings: two into the World Trade Center’s Twin Towers in New York City, one into the Pentagon, and the fourth was crashed in a Pennsylvania field with the intended target unknown. This event caused the death of over 3,000 Americans. To many, this was a moment that changed many people’s opinions about the Muslim other. Many Americans felt personally attacked by Al-Qaeda, and by the Muslim world as a whole. They wanted safety and revenge for those who died. Americans demanded action, to ensure the deaths were not in vain.

While this event changed many people’s opinions in the US and in the Western World, the United States had been involved in the foreign policy of Middle-Eastern Muslims for years prior. This fact is referenced as justification by Osama bin Laden in his Letter to America. He cited US involvement against Palestine, Somalia, Chechnya, Kashmir, and support of the Jewish in Lebanon. According to bin Laden, the United States had been acting against Muslims and targeting the Muslim world for the better part of the past century. Such an opinion indicates that the problem goes deeper than what many American people believe. The 9/11 attacks, then, were a moment that such fear of the Muslim other became widespread and public.

Shortly after the 9/11 attacks, the United States responded by upping airport security through establishing the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) with the Aviation and Transportation Security Act on November 19th, 2001. The administration claims that everything they are doing is in the interests of public safety; their mission statement is to
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“[p]rotect the nation’s transportation systems to ensure freedom of movement for people and commerce”\textsuperscript{68}. However, the administration has often been criticized for their protocols and inefficiency. For example it was found in 2015 that when tested, TSA agents failed to detect bombs or weapons over 95\% of the time\textsuperscript{69}. In one test, the alarms went off, but a pat-down did not reveal the explosives. In another example, released February of 2017, the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) released an article attacking the TSA’s behavior detection techniques as ineffective and hubs of racial/religious profiling\textsuperscript{70}. They cited a 2012 article in the New York Times, where TSA officials claimed the behavior detection program included racial profiling\textsuperscript{71}. The ACLU references a set of images found in a TSA presentation\textsuperscript{72} where a little girl and her mother were veiled. The mother also mentioned Allah, expressing grief as the daughter asked for a suicide bomber doll. The images equate Muslim women with terrorism.

The TSA is not the sole reaction to fear of the Muslim other. In 2003, the United States entered Iraq. The Bush administration made the claim that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction (WMDs). Such a claim resonated with the American people and politicians in the aftermath of 9/11, and as such, the US invasion of Iraq was allowed. However, WMDs were never found. Rather than accepting misleading information and withdrawing, the Bush administration changed their reasoning to a protection of the Middle East and democracy\textsuperscript{73}. With this, US forces stayed in Iraq until 2011, when Obama withdrew the troops after negotiations to extend the timeline failed\textsuperscript{74}. While no declaration of war was made, the Iraq “War” lasted over 8 years.

\textsuperscript{68} TSA official website mission statement
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After failing to find WMDs, it became revealed that the Bush administration lied about the existence of WMDs in Iraq. Ultimately, it key members of the Bush administration had pushed false pretenses for the Iraq War. By some accounts, 935 false statements regarding the Iraq War were made leading up to it. President George W. Bush, Vice President Dick Cheney, Press Secretaries Ari Fleischer and Scott McClellan, Secretaries of State Colin Powell and Condoleezza Rice, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, and Deputy Secretary of Defence Paul Wolfowitz all helped deliberately plan a campaign to send the nation to war with Iraq under false pretenses. When this story broke, the opinion of the Iraq War took a more negative shift. President Obama ran and was elected on an anti-war platform in 2008; however, he spent the entirety of his two terms as president fighting in various Muslim nations.

In the 2016 election, Donald Trump ran and won on a platform with strong anti-Muslim positions. He stated in an August speech in Youngstown that “Radical Islamic Terrorism” was the issue America had to stand against now. He blamed Muslim extremists for attacking the US or Europe “every 84 hours”. In his campaign, Trump claimed Islam is a violent religion harboring violent extremists, and criticized Muslims for not doing enough to condemn the extremists’ actions. Once elected, he pushed for an executive order that would place immigration bans on Muslim-majority nations. The order, titled the “Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States” Order, banned Syrian refugees indefinitely and banned immigrants from seven Muslim-majority nations for a 90-day period. The ban included Iraq, Iran, Syria, Sudan, Libya, Somalia, and Yemen. The immigration ban outlined provisions for minority religious factions to get priority entry to help avoid persecution. This ban was
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overturned in the court system, so the Trump administration returned with a new ban that removed Iraq from the list as well as the religious minority priority provisions\(^80\). Besides these changes, the second immigration ban is the same as the first.

Such a modern fear is not just present in our elected officials, it is also present in other government agencies such as the FBI. They have an entire portion of their website dedicated to countering what they call “violent extremism”: defined as “encouraging, condoning, justifying, or supporting the commission of a violent act to achieve political, ideological, religious, social, or economic goals”\(^81\). While this may seem facially neutral, four out of the six international terrorist organizations that the FBI list are Islamic: ISIS, Al-Qaeda, Al-Shabaab, and Hezbollah (the other two are Kahane Chai and FARC)\(^82\). The focus on Islamic terrorist groups is a product of the fear of a Muslim other in political and social spheres.

As demonstrated through a historical analysis, there is history of the Muslim other dictating political policy and social opinion in the 21st century United States. With the history of the Muslim other covered, some questions must be asked to analyze the Muslim other. The questions are: who turned these people into the other, through what methods, did it end and if so how, and how do Hofstadter’s, Foucault’s, and Scott’s analyses fit in?

To understand who and the methods, it helps to return to the Bush era, as this is the group where this fear really consumed Americans. In a post-9/11 America, many people expressed a fear of the Muslim other in social circles. Social concerns often translate to political concerns of elected officials. As a result, there was a growing fear of the Muslim other across the US, leading to elected officials supporting measures that targeted the Muslim other. Plenty of members of the Bush administration took active roles, capitalizing on this fear citing reasons like
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public safety. Vice President Cheney had close ties to the oil company Halliburton; before Vice President, he had served as their Chief Executive. While there was no evidence Cheney had direct contact with or was pulling strings for Halliburton, the oil company received benefits during the Bush administration including a massive contract with the US government to rebuild the Iraqi oil fields. While there is no direct evidence, it seems reasonable to believe there could have been a profit motive for US involvement in Iraq, and this fear of the other could have been manipulated for profit. Thus, it could be said that political and financial elites propagated this fear for fiscal gain. However, it seems the elites had not produced this fear of the other. The American people heard negative stories of the Muslim other through the media, and reacted to this. The media could be seen as being at fault for producing this fear of the other, while the political and business elites were responsible for maintaining and propagating it.

It is unreasonable to consider the fear of the Muslim other as “ended”, though there was a decrease for a period in time. In 2015, with Trump’s campaign in full swing, assaults on Muslims jumped up to 2001 levels. The number of assaults on Muslims experienced a relative low immediately after 2001, but climbed upwards from 2005-2010. In 2011-2014, the number was relatively consistent. As this data demonstrates, the fear of the Muslim other is still alive in the United States. However, such a fear may have peaked, and could be in decline. As the Bush administration’s motives were brought into question and both the Bush administration’s false pretenses and the TSA’s various issues have been revealed, many people began shifting their opinion. Furthermore, though Trump won his election, there is indication that he may have won in spite of, not because of, his views on the Muslim other. Trump’s favorability ratings have been very low for a president just taking office; in February of 2017, Trump held an approval

83 New York Times article outlining Cheney’s and the Bush administration’s relationships with Halliburton
84 Pew Research Center, citing FBI data
rating of 39%, with a disapproval rating of 56% 85. This is a lower approval rating upon entry and a higher disapproval rating upon entry than any previous modern president. As Trump has become the de-facto head of the American fear of the Muslim other, this data may be good for those who oppose this fear. The American people generally do not seem to be buying his tactics.

Hofstadter’s paranoid style fits the initial methods of the production of the Muslim other. The paranoids in this example would be those clamoring for retaliation immediately after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. While their feelings may be understandable, they still advocated this paranoid style: they saw Muslim as bad, and the source of all evil in the modern world. They viewed it in absolutes, that America and the Western World was all that is good, and that Muslims oppose all that is good and right, and are thus entirely bad. They seemed to believe that Muslims would destroy any other way of life, unless we put a stop to Muslims. This is the paranoid style advocated, and it transformed Muslims from a group of people with some jerks, to a scapegoat for everything wrong with the world.

Foucault’s analysis fits into the propagation of the Muslim other. Islam is delinquency, certain Muslims delinquents, and the institution the state and their financial ties. The state, to maintain power, must appeal to the fear. If there is a fear of the Muslim other, the state must react to this in order to keep power. By equating Islam with delinquency, it teaches delinquents a lesson. If the delinquents wish to come to the United States, they must reform themselves. Those who fail to do so cannot come to or stay in the United States. Both options keep the delinquents out of the public eye, and a certain fear of the unknown sets in. The delinquents already present attempt to reject and break free of their delinquency. This is how the state maintains power, and continues molding the citizen to fit the state’s needs.

85 Pew Research Center, analyzing favorability of presidents
Though, it is also important to note with this case that the American people likely would not stand for blatant religious discrimination as a part of the public transcript. This is unconstitutional, and something that many Americans would take issue with, as seen under the Trump travel ban. Therefore, the state cannot advocate blatant discrimination based on religion. The state then adopts the idea of what a “good Muslim” is, as a model to use in Foucault’s analysis, while keeping the religious discrimination in the hidden transcript. A “good” Muslim, as Mahmood Mamdani puts it in his book *Good Muslim, Bad Muslim*, is a Muslim that has become generally secular, and westernized. The Muslim has assimilated, and left these primitive notions of religious fervor behind to participate in an enlightened state. The “bad” Muslim, then, fails to do this, and they are seen as religious fanatics and barbarians, who cannot participate in an enlightened democracy.\(^\text{86}\) This distinction between a “good” and a “bad” Muslim is at the core of the reform the state wishes to implement. They wish to reform Muslims to “good” Muslims, preventing them from being too fanatical about their religion, which is a trait for “bad” Muslims. Those who fail to be rehabilitated become social and political outcasts, and those who succeed become accepted, “assimilated” Muslims. They become the “good” Muslims.

Scott’s the hidden and public transcripts can also be applied elsewhere. Scott’s transcripts rely on the manipulation of language to hide the aims of the oppressor or the oppressed. In the case of the Muslim other, there are three groups: the oppressors, the oppressed, and the neutrals. This adds another layer of complexity: the oppressors and the oppressed fight not only with each other, but for the third group. The neutrals have no transcript; they are the audience for the power game the two other groups play. The public transcripts are prepared for and the hidden transcripts hidden from the neutrals. The goal is no longer solely to expose the hidden transcript of the other group while keeping your own hidden transcript hidden. There is

\(^{86}\) *Good Muslim, Bad Muslim*
another goal, to convince the neutrals of your public transcript and convert them to your side. That being said, there is a fight to publicize the hidden transcript: the perfect example of this is when the Bush administration got America involved in Iraq under false pretenses. This caused the neutrals and even some oppressors to question and undermine the power of the Bush administration. Today, Americans call out President Trump for lying, and trying to hide the hidden transcript. The hidden transcript is being publicized, and this is leading to the beginning of the end.

A Comparison of the Three Case Studies

The three cases presented are not identical; there are some clear facial differences: they happened during different time periods, and different strategies were used by those in power. However, these are largely surface-level differences. This analysis should help better understand similarities and differences of the three cases, and identify some general trends.

Richard Hofstadter describes just how the other is produced. He compares the Communist other to various previous “others”, and compares their similarities and differences, noting that, according to those who set themselves up in opposition to these “others”, they feel that “[t]he old American virtues have already been eaten away… the old national security and independence have been destroyed by treasonous plots, having as their most powerful agents not merely outsiders… but major statesmen who are at the center of American power”\textsuperscript{87}. This is the reason he gives for the “average” American’s fear of the other, and it seems to hold for the examples outlined. In New Orleans, people saw Italians gaining wealth and political influence at the local level. When Italians were tried for murder, they were acquitted despite seeming evidence of their wrongdoing. To the mob that stormed the prison, this oversight of justice was
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due to the Italian Mafia corrupting their own justice system. Perhaps not a great statesman, but a perceived corruption of local politics, which is Hofstadter’s main point: politics itself has become corrupted to the paranoid. With the Communist example, Sen. McCarthy pushed that individuals in the State Department were Communists influencing national policy. This led to an in-depth search and the push for HUAC to find examples of Communist activities in the United States. Furthermore, in the Overman Committee investigations, there was concern that business leaders in the brewing industry peddled Communist ideologies at the expense of the United States. Foreigners from Europe were, in the opinion of the paranoid, working with the state to undermine American ideals of capitalism. And the Muslim other after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, many Americans felt the need for revenge and a general fear of Muslims. However, perhaps due to such a quick and relatively politically unified response against Muslims, little blame was placed on the state for conspiring with Muslims to undermine American safety. While Hofstadter’s assessment generally strike true, the Muslim other does not include an attack on the state for conspiring with the other.

It seems as though there is a common trend here of all three groups: the fear of the “other” starts with the general public demanding that the state do something to protect the “average” people from the treats that this “other” happens to pose. Whether or not the state is seen as being involved varies; however, there is a sense that the state is no longer in full control of internal affairs. With the Italian other, this comes in the Mafia controlling the trials; with the Communist other, it is Soviet propaganda to undermine capitalism; with the Muslim other, it is Muslims killing thousands of Americans on US soil in the 9/11 terrorist attacks. In all three cases, the paranoid felt that the other was somehow undermining American safety, security, and
way of life. Furthermore, the paranoid felt the government had to protect the safety, security, and way of life of the American people.

This begs the question: why would the American public began to fear the other so much? There seems to be a rather simple common factor behind this as well: this fear is an initial reactionary force against instability abroad. In the case of the Italian other, Italian unification created an unstable setting for many agrarian, impoverished Southern Italians. This, coupled with bad harvests, led many of these laborers to the United States looking for opportunities to make money to support their families, which were either with them in the United States or back in Italy. The political, economic, and food-based insecurity of Italy led to a mass emigration from Italy, which created a reactionary force of Americans used to the status quo that Italians disrupted. In the case of the Communist other, this instability abroad was the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917. Such a revolution made many capitalists, who benefitted under the current capitalist system, fear such a revolution could occur in the United States. They began a reactionary fear of the Communist other in response to the political instability of a regime change in Russia. In the Muslim other, the instability abroad was the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Such an event demonstrated that there was religious and political instability in the Middle East region, as the region had terrorist organizations large enough to pose a serious threat to the United States. Due to this instability, Americans felt a reactionary fear of the Muslim other.

There are also other similarities, which warrant an analysis of Foucault in relation to the three cases. In examining the power relations in the propagation of the other, there is another pattern: in all cases, the other is labelled as a delinquent in the eyes of the state institution. The state attempts to use power to reform the delinquents in the general citizenry. These delinquents are the other, and to reform their delinquency would be to assimilate them. In Wop! A
Documentary History of Anti-Italian Discrimination, Salvatore J. LaGumina cited an example from the New Orleans Times-Democrat: “The Germans, the Irish and others… migrate to this country, adopt its customs, acquire its language, master its institutions, and identify themselves with its destiny. The Italians, never. They remain isolated from the rest of any community… seldom learn to speak our tongue, they have no respect for our laws or our form of government, they are always foreigners. And now the Italian… are preparing for an excursion into local politics”88. This quote cites the belief that the Italian other does not assimilate properly, and cannot be expected to break their delinquency. This quote also implies “real” Americans should be outraged at these people’s attempts to take over American government to suit their needs, as they are not “proper” Americans. Ultimately, these opinions led to internment camps in WW2 trying to force Italians to assimilate or send them back to Italy, as well as stricter quotas on immigration. In the case of the Communist other, the various Committees to get suspected Communists to either reform themselves from the delinquency of Communism or find themselves deported serve this purpose89. With the Muslim other, there is not a large-scale political roundup of Muslims directly, though the TSA has been racially profiling Muslims. In the case of the TSA, Muslims are delinquents, and Islam is delinquency. The hope is for them to assimilate, or to be punished for not accepting the opportunity to reform. Another example is the travel bans under the Trump administration: the travel bans, especially the first, prevented delinquents from initially entering. In institutional terms, the institution of the state hoped to prevent delinquency from spreading in the first place by preventing the delinquency from entrance into the institution. This also threatens delinquents within the institution, to help
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convince them to abandon delinquency. Ultimately, there is a pattern of propagation through pushing the other as a delinquent and treating them as such.

Another factor to look into is Scott’s analysis of language. While his points mainly assist in helping to better understand how legislation can be used to enforce the power of the oppressor on the oppressed, his analysis also makes the hidden transcript of the oppressors a public transcript as a way to combat otherness. In the case of the Communist other, exposing McCarthy led to the public to turn against the narrative of the Communist other. The Communist other slowly faded and new generations became more accepting of Communist or leftist ideas in the American political sphere. In the Muslim other, younger and less politically seasoned individuals express less unfavorable views of Islam than those of older generations. This data is from 2015, and the youngest age group (18-29) have seen the Muslim other in terms of the Bush administration’s false pretenses and the rhetoric of the Trump administration. These incidences, especially the WMD falsification of the Bush administration, are an example of the hidden transcript of the Bush administration becoming public. While the fear of the Muslim other is not gone, such fear cannot disappear overnight. Age group by age group, however, the number is diminishing, which indicates that there may be a future in which the Muslim other is no longer accepted. The unique case in this analysis, though, would probably be the Italian other. It is difficult to say that the Italian other is no longer feared to some degree. Organized crime often leads to the Italian mafia, and if Italians are not generalized as criminals, they are seen as sex-crazed morons. As LaGumina notes, “[b]ooks, motion pictures, television shows, newspaper columns, games, advertisements, and comedians have exploited the issue ad nauseum”. The fear is more subtle now, but it still exists. However, it does not exist despite of
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publicizing the hidden transcript of the oppressors; rather, it exists because there has not been a publicizing of the hidden transcript of the oppressors. There has been no McCarthy-style, nationally televised exposure. Nor has there been a large-scale publicizing of a massive, oft-repeated lie from the federal government like there was with the Bush administration. With no McCarthy or Bush-style exposure of the hidden transcript to the general public, there has not been a defining event in the history of the Italian other where the hidden transcript has become public. There has been no dramatic reveal, and the otherness of the Italian other continues.

**Summary and Conclusion**

There are four consistent trends between the three cases. First off, that the fear of the other was produced by instability abroad. That instability could differ, but an instability must exist. Second, instability causes a reactionary fear of the other in certain groups. The specific group differs depending on who feels most targeted by the instability abroad, but there is a reactionary group demanding some form of protection from the government. This sets up an idea of what is a good and proper American, and where Foucault’s analysis comes in handy. Those deviating from the path of a good and proper American are delinquents and should be punished for their delinquency. This propagates the fear of the other. Finally, the fear of the other continues to propagate until it reaches a crescendo, and the hidden transcript of the oppressors becomes publicized in a large, showy event. These are some major, consistent factors present in all three cases. Hofstadter’s work best informs the production of otherness, Foucault informs the propagation, and Scott’s work can inform the stop of the propagation.
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Appendices

Appendix A: Transcripts from HUAC; source: Digital HUAC

Fig. A1: Reagan’s HUAC Transcript. Reagan was a “friendly” witness.

CHAIRMAN J. PARNELL THOMAS: The record will show that Mr. McDowell, Mr. Vail, Mr. Nixon, and Mr. Thomas are present. A subcommittee is sitting. Staff members present: Mr. Robert E. Stripling, chief investigator; Messrs. Louis J. Russell, H.A. Smith, and Robert B. Gaston, investigators; and Mr. Benjamin Mandel, director of research.

STRIPLING: When and where were you born, Mr. Reagan?
RONALD REAGAN: Tampico, Illinois, February 6, 1911.
STRIPLING: What is your present occupation?
REAGAN: Motion picture actor.
STRIPLING: How long have you been engaged in that profession?
REAGAN: Since June 1937, with a brief interlude of 3 1/2 years -- that at the time didn't seem very brief.
STRIPLING: What period was that?
REAGAN: That was during the late war.
STRIPLING: What branch of service were you in?
REAGAN: Well, sir, I had been for several years in the Reserve as an officer in the United States Cavalry, but I was assigned to the Air Corps.
STRIPLING: That is kind of typical of the Army, isn't it?
MCDOWELL: You didn't wear spurs?
REAGAN: I did for a little while.
CHAIRMAN: I think this has little to do with the facts we are seeking. Proceed.
STRIPLING: Mr. Reagan, are you a member of any guild?
REAGAN: Yes, sir, the Screen Actors Guild.
STRIPLING: How long have you been a member?
REAGAN: Since June 1937.
STRIPLING: Are you the president of the guild at the present time?
REAGAN: Yes, sir.
STRIPLING: When were you elected?
REAGAN: That was several months ago. I was elected to replace Mr. (Robert) Montgomery when he resigned.
STRIPLING: When does your term expire?
REAGAN: The elections come up next month.
STRIPLING: Have you ever held any other position in the Screen Actors Guild?
REAGAN: Yes, sir. Just prior to the war I was a member of the board of directors, and just after the war, prior to my being elected president, I was a member of the board of directors.
STRIPLING: As a member of the board of directors, as president of the Screen Actors Guild, and as an active member, have you at any time observed or noted within the organization a clique of either communists or fascists who were attempting to exert influence or pressure on the guild?
REAGAN: Well, sir, my testimony must be very similar to that of Mr. (George) Murphy and Mr. (Robert) Montgomery. There has been a small group within the Screen Actors Guild which has consistently opposed the policy of the guild board and officers of the guild, as evidenced by the vote on various issues. That small clique referred to has been suspected of more or less following the tactics that we associate with the Communist Party.

STRIPLING: Would you refer to them as a disruptive influence within the guild?

REAGAN: I would say that at times they have attempted to be a disruptive influence.

STRIPLING: You have no knowledge yourself as to whether or not any of them are members of the Communist Party?

REAGAN: No, sir, I have no investigative force, or anything, and I do not know.

STRIPLING: Has it ever been reported to you that certain members of the guild were communists?

REAGAN: Yes, sir, I have heard different discussions and some of them tagged as communists.

STRIPLING: Would you say that this clique has attempted to dominate the guild?

REAGAN: Well, sir, by attempting to put their own particular views on various issues, I guess you would have to say that our side was attempting to dominate, too, because we were fighting just as hard to put over our views, and I think, we were proven correct by the figures --Mr. Murphy gave the figures -- and those figures were always approximately the same, an average of 90 percent or better of the Screen Actors Guild voted in favor of those matters now guild policy.

STRIPLING: Mr. Reagan, there has been testimony to the effect here that numerous communist-front organizations have been set up in Hollywood. Have you ever been solicited to join any of those organizations or any organization which you considered to be a communist-front organization?

REAGAN: Well, sir, I have received literature from an organization called the Committee for a Far-Eastern Democratic Policy. I don't know whether it is communist or not. I only know that I didn't like their views and as a result I didn't want to have anything to do with them.

STRIPLING: Were you ever solicited to sponsor the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee?

REAGAN: No, sir, I was never solicited to do that, but I found myself misled into being a sponsor on another occasion for a function that was held under the auspices of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.

STRIPLING: Did you knowingly give your name as a sponsor?

REAGAN: Not knowingly. Could I explain what that occasion was?

STRIPLING: Yes sir.

REAGAN: I was called several weeks ago. There happened to be a financial drive on to raise money to build a badly needed hospital called the All Nations Hospital. I think the purpose of the building is so obvious by the title that it has the support of most of the people of Los Angeles. Certainly of most of the doctors. Some time ago I was called to the telephone. A woman introduced herself by name. I didn't make any particular note of her name, and I couldn't give it now. She told me that there would be a recital held at which Paul Robeson would sing, and she said that all the money for the tickets would go to the hospital, and asked if she could use my name as one of the sponsors. I hesitated for a moment, because I don't think that Mr. Robeson's and my political views coincide at all; and then I thought I was being a little stupid because, I thought, here is an occasion where Mr. Robeson is perhaps appearing as an artist, and certainly the object, raising money, is above any political consideration: it is a hospital supported by everyone. I have contributed money myself. So I felt a little bit as if I had been stuffy for a minute, and I said, "Certainly, you can use my
name." I left town for a couple of weeks and, when I returned, I was handed a newspaper story that said that this recital was held at the Shrine Auditorium in Los Angeles under the auspices of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee. The principal speaker was Emil Lustig, Robert Burman took up a collection, and the remnants of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade were paraded on the platform. I did not, in the newspaper story, see one word about the hospital. I called the newspaper and said I am not accustomed to writing to editors but would like to explain my position, and he laughed and said, "You needn't bother, you are about the 50th person who had also been listed as sponsors of that affair."

STRIPLING: Would you say from your observation that that is typical of the tactics of the communists, to solicit and use the names of prominent people to either raise money or gain support?

REAGAN: I think it is in keeping with their tactics, yes sir.

STRIPLING: Do you think there is anything democratic about those tactics?

REAGAN: I do not, sir.

STRIPLING: As president of the Screen Actors Guild, you are familiar with the jurisdictional strike which has been going on in Hollywood for some time?

REAGAN: Yes, sir.

STRIPLING: Have you ever had any conference with any of the labor officials regarding this strike?

REAGAN: Yes, sir.

STRIPLING: Do you know whether the communists have participated in any way with this strike?

REAGAN: Sir, the first time that this word "communist" was ever injected into any of the meetings concerning the strike was at a meeting in Chicago with Mr. William Hutchinson, president of the carpenters' union, who were on strike at the time. He asked the Screen Actors Guild to submit terms to Mr. (Richard) Walsh, and he told us to tell Mr. Walsh that, if he would give in on these terms, he in turn would break run this Sorrell and the other commies out -- I am quoting him -- and break it up. I might add that Mr. Walsh and Mr. Sorrell were running the strike for Mr. Hutchinson in Hollywood.

STRIPLING: Mr. Reagan, what is your feeling about what steps should be taken to rid the motion picture industry of any communist influences?

REAGAN: Well, sir, 99 percent of us are pretty well aware of what is going on, and I think, within the bounds of our democratic rights and never once stepping over the rights given us by democracy, we have done a pretty good job in our business of keeping those people's activities curtailed. After all, we must recognize them at present as a political party. On that basis we have exposed their lies when we came across them, we have opposed their propaganda, and I can certainly testify that in the case of the Screen Actors Guild we have been eminently successful in preventing them from, with their usual tactics, trying to run a majority of an organization with a well organized minority. In opposing those people, the best thing to do is make democracy work. In the Screen Actors Guild we make it work by insuring everyone a vote and by keeping everyone informed. I believe that, as Thomas Jefferson put it, if all the American people know all of the facts they will never make a mistake. Whether the party should be outlawed, that is a matter for the government to decide. As a citizen, I would hesitate to see any political party outlawed on the basis of its political ideology. However, if it is proven that an organization is an agent of foreign power, or in any way not a legitimate political party -- and I think the government is capable of proving that -- then that is another
matter. I happen to be very proud of the industry in which I work; I happen to be very proud of the way in which we conducted the fight. I do not believe the communists have ever at any time been able to use the motion picture screen as a sounding board for their philosophy or ideology.

CHAIRMAN: There is one thing that you said that interested me very much. That was the quotation from Jefferson. That is why this committee was created by the House of Representatives: to acquaint the American people with the facts. Once the American people are acquainted with the facts there is no question but what the American people will do the kind of job that they want done: that is, to make America just as pure as we can possibly make it. We want to thank you very much for coming here today.

REAGAN: Sir, I detest, I abhor their philosophy, but I detest more than that their tactics, which are those of the fifth column, and are dishonest, but at the same time I never as a citizen want to see our country become urged, by either fear or resentment of this group, that we ever compromise with any of our democratic principles through that fear or resentment. I still think that democracy can do it.

Fig. A2: Seeger’s HUAC Transcript. Seeger was an “unfriendly” witness.

MR. TAVENNER: When and where were you born, Mr. Seeger?
MR. SEEGER: I was born in New York in 1919.
MR. TAVENNER: What is your profession or occupation?
MR. SEEGER: Well, I have worked at many things, and my main profession is a student of American folklore, and I make my living as a banjo picker-sort of damning, in some people's opinion.
MR. TAVENNER Has New York been your headquarters for a considerable period of time?
MR. SEEGER: No, I lived here only rarely until I left school, and after a year or two or a few years living here after World War II I got back to the country, where I always felt more at home.
MR. TAVENNER: You say that you were in the Armed Forces of the United States?
MR. SEEGER: About three and a half years.
MR. TAVENNER: Will you tell us please the period of your service?
MR. SEEGER: I went in in July 1942 and I was mustered out in December 1945.
MR. TAVENNER: Did you attain the rank of an officer?
MR. SEEGER: No. After about a year I made Pfc, and just before I got out I got to be T-5, which is in the equivilant of a corporal's rating, a long hard pull.
MR. TAVENNER: Mr. Seeger, prior to your entry in the service in 1942, were you engaged in the practice of your profession in the area of New York?
MR. SEEGER: It is hard to call it a profession. I kind of drifted into it and I never intended to be a musician, and I am glad I am one now, and it is a very honorable profession, but when I started out actually I wanted to be a newspaperman, and when I left school --
CHAIRMAN WALTER: Will you answer the question, please?
MR. SEEGER: I have to explain that it really wasn't my profession, I picked up a little change in it.
CHAIRMAN WALTER: Did you practice your profession?
MR. SEEGER: I sang for people, yes, before World War II, and I also did as early as 1925.
MR. TAVENNER: And upon your return from the service in December of 1945, you continued in your profession?
MR. SEEGER: I continued singing, and I expect I always will.

MR. TAVENNER: The Committee has information obtained in part from the Daily Worker indicating that, over a period of time, especially since December of 1945, you took part in numerous entertainment features. I have before me a photostatic copy of the June 20, 1947, issue of the Daily Worker. In a column entitled "What's On" appears this advertisement: "Tonight-Bronx, hear Peter Seeger and his guitar, at Allerton Section housewarming." May I ask you whether or not the Allerton Section was a section of the Communist Party?

MR. SEEGER: Sir, I refuse to answer that question whether it was a quote from the New York Times or the Vegetarian Journal.

MR. TAVENNER: I don't believe there is any more authoritative document in regard to the Communist Party than its official organ, the Daily Worker.

MR. SCHERER: He hasn't answered the question, and he merely said he wouldn't answer whether the article appeared in the New York Times or some other magazine. I ask you to direct the witness to answer the question.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: I direct you to answer.

MR. SEEGER: Sir, the whole line of questioning-

CHAIRMAN WALTER: You have only been asked one question, so far.

MR. SEEGER: I am not going to answer any questions as to my association, my philosophical or religious beliefs or my political beliefs, or how I voted in any election, or any of these private affairs. I think these are very improper questions for any American to be asked, especially under such compulsion as this. I would be very glad to tell you my life if you want to hear of it.

MR. TAVENNER: Has the witness declined to answer this specific question?

CHAIRMAN WALTER: He said that he is not going to answer any questions, any names or things.

MR. SCHERER: He was directed to answer the question.

MR. TAVENNER: I have before me a photostatic copy of the April 30, 1948, issue of the Daily Worker which carries under the same title of "What's On," an advertisement of a "May Day Rally: For Peace, Security and Democracy." The advertisement states: "Are you in a fighting mood? Then attend the May Day rally." Expert speakers are stated to be slated for the program, and then follows a statement, "Entertainment by Pete Seeger." At the bottom appears this: "Auspices Essex County Communist Party," and at the top, "Tonight, Newark, N.J." Did you lend your talent to the Essex County Communist Party on the occasion indicated by this article from the Daily Worker?

MR. SEEGER: Mr. Walter, I believe I have already answered this question, and the same answer.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: The same answer. In other words, you mean that you decline to answer because of the reasons stated before?

MR. SEEGER: I gave my answer, sir.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: What is your answer?

MR. SEEGER: You see, sir, I feel-

CHAIRMAN WALTER: What is your answer?

MR. SEEGER: I will tell you what my answer is.

(Witness consulted with counsel [Paul L. Ross].)

I feel that in my whole life I have never done anything of any conspiratorial nature and I resent very much and very deeply the implication of being called before this Committee that in some way because my opinions may be different from yours, or yours, Mr. Willis, or yours, Mr.
Scherer, that I am any less of an American than anybody else. I love my country very deeply, sir.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Why don't you make a little contribution toward preserving its institutions?

MR. SEEGER: I feel that my whole life is a contribution. That is why I would like to tell you about it.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: I don't want to hear about it.

MR. SCHERER: I think that there must be a direction to answer.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: I direct you to answer that question.

MR. SEEGER: I have already given you my answer, sir.

MR. SCHERER: Let me understand. You are not relying on the Fifth Amendment, are you?

MR. SEEGER: No, sir, although I do not want to in any way discredit or depreciate or deprecate the witnesses that have used the Fifth Amendment, and I simply feel it is improper for this committee to ask such questions.

MR. SCHERER: And then in answering the rest of the questions, or in refusing to answer the rest of the questions, I understand that you are not relying on the Fifth Amendment as a basis for your refusal to answer?

MR. SEEGER: No, I am not, sir.

MR. TAVENNER: I have before me a photostatic copy of May 4, 1949, issue of the Daily Worker, which has an article entitled, "May Day Smash Review Put on by Communist Cultural Division, On Stage," and the article was written by Bob Reed. This article emphasizes a production called Now Is the Time, and it says this: Now Is the Time was a hard-hitting May Day show of songs and knife-edged satire. New songs and film strips walloped the enemies of the people in what the singers called "Aesopian language." And other persons [participated], including Pete Seeger. Lee Hays is recited to be the MC, or master of ceremonies. Did you take part in this May Day program under the auspices of the Music Section of the Cultural Division of the Communist Party?

MR. SEEGER: Mr. Chairman, the answer is the same as before.

MR. SCHERER: I think we have to have a direction.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: I direct you to answer the question.

MR. SEEGER: I have given you my answer, sir.

MR. TAVENNER: The article contains another paragraph, as follows: This performance of Now Is the Time was given in honor of the twelve indicted Communist Party leaders. And then it continues with Bob Reed's account of the show: This reviewer has never seen a show which stirred its audience more. Add up new material, fine personal and group performances, overwhelming audience response - the result was a significant advance in the people's cultural movement. Now Is the Time is that rare phenomenon, a political show in which performers and audience had a lot of fun. It should be repeated for large audiences. Mr. Lee Hays was asked, while he was on the witness stand, whether or not he wrote that play, and he refused to answer. Do you know whether he was the originator of the script?

MR. SEEGER: Do I know whether he was the originator of the script? Again my answer is the same. However, if you want to question me about any songs, I would be glad to tell you, sir.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: That is what you are being asked about now.

MR. TAVENNER: You said that you would tell us about the songs. Did you participate in a program at Wingdale Lodge in the State of New York, which is a summer camp for adults and children, on the weekend of July Fourth of this year?

(Witness consulted with counsel.)
MR. SEEGER: Again, I say I will be glad to tell what songs I have ever sung, because singing is my business.
MR. TAVENNER: I am going to ask you.
MR. SEEGER: But I decline to say who has ever listened to them, who has written them, or other people who have sung them.
MR. TAVENNER: Did you sing this song, to which we have referred, "Now Is the Time," at Wingdale Lodge on the weekend of July Fourth?
MR. SEEGER: I don't know any song by that name, and I know a song with a similar name. It is called "Wasn't That a Time." Is that the song?
CHAIRMAN WALTER: Did you sing that song?
MR. SEEGER: I can sing it. I don't know how well I can do it without my banjo.
CHAIRMAN WALTER: I said, Did you sing it on that occasion?
MR. SEEGER: I have sung that song. I am not going to go into where I have sung it. I have sung it many places.
CHAIRMAN WALTER: Did you sing it on this particular occasion? That is what you are being asked.
MR. SEEGER: Again my answer is the same.
CHAIRMAN WALTER: You said that you would tell us about it.
MR. SEEGER: I will tell you about the songs, but I am not going to tell you or try to explain-
CHAIRMAN WALTER: I direct you to answer the question. Did you sing this particular song on the Fourth of July at Wingdale Lodge in New York?
MR. SEEGER: I have already given you my answer to that question, and all questions such as that. I feel that is improper: to ask about my associations and opinions. I have said that I would be voluntarily glad to tell you any song, or what I have done in my life.
CHAIRMAN WALTER: I think it is my duty to inform you that we don't accept this answer and the others, and I give you an opportunity now to answer these questions, particularly the last one.
MR. SEEGER: Sir, my answer is always the same.
CHAIRMAN WALTER: All right, go ahead, Mr. Tavenner.
MR. TAVENNER: Were you chosen by Mr. Elliott Sullivan to take part in the program on the weekend of July Fourth at Wingdale Lodge?
MR. SEEGER: The answer is the same, sir.
MR. WILLIS: Was that the occasion of the satire on the Constitution and the Bill of Rights?
MR. TAVENNER: The same occasion, yes, sir. I have before me a photostatic copy of a page from the June 1, 1949, issue of the Daily Worker, and in a column entitled "Town Talk" there is found this statement: The first performance of a new song, "If I Had a Hammer," on the theme of the Foley Square trial of the Communist leaders, will he given at a testimonial dinner for the 12 on Friday night at St. Nicholas Arena . . . Among those on hand for the singing will be . . . Pete Seeger, and Lee Hays- and others whose names are mentioned. Did you take part in that performance?
MR. SEEGER: I shall he glad to answer about the song, sir, and I am not interested in carrying on the line of questioning about where I have sung any songs.
MR. TAVENNER: I ask a direction.
CHAIRMAN WALTER: You may not be interested, but we are, however. I direct you to answer. You can answer that question.
MR. SEEGER: I feel these questions are improper, sir, and I feel they are immoral to ask any American this kind of question.
MR. TAVENNER: Have you finished your answer?
MR. SEEGER: Yes, sir.
MR. TAVENNER: I desire to offer the document in evidence and ask that it be marked "Seeger exhibit No.4," for identification only, and to be made a part of the Committee files.
MR. SEEGER: I am sorry you are not interested in the song. It is a good song.
MR. TAVENNER: Were you present in the hearing room while the former witnesses testified?
MR. SEEGER: I have been here all morning, yes, sir.
MR. TAVENNER: I assume then that you heard me read the testimony of Mr. [Elia] Kazan about the purpose of the Communist Party in having its actors entertain for the benefit of Communist fronts and the Communist Party. Did you hear that testimony?
MR. SEEGER: Yes, I have heard all of the testimony today.
MR. TAVENNER: Did you hear Mr. George Hall's testimony yesterday in which he stated, as an actor, the special contribution that he was expected to make to the Communist Party was to use his talents by entertaining at Communist Party functions? Did you hear that testimony?
MR. SEEGER: I didn't hear it, no.
MR. TAVENNER: It is a fact that he so testified. I want to know whether or not you were engaged in a similar type of service to the Communist Party in entertaining at these features. (Witness consulted with counsel.)
MR. SEEGER: I have sung for Americans of every political persuasion, and I am proud that I never refuse to sing to an audience, no matter what religion or color of their skin, or situation in life. I have sung in hobo jungles, and I have sung for the Rockefellers, and I am proud that I have never refused to sing for anybody. That is the only answer I can give along that line.
CHAIRMAN WALTER: Mr. Tavenner, are you getting around to that letter? There was a letter introduced yesterday that I think was of greater importance than any bit of evidence adduced at these hearings, concerning the attempt made to influence people in this professional performers' guild and union to assist a purely Communist cause which had no relation whatsoever to the arts and the theater. Is that what you are leading up to?
MR. TAVENNER: Yes, it is. That was the letter of Peter Lawrence, which I questioned him about yesterday. That related to the trial of the Smith Act defendants here at Foley Square. I am trying to inquire now whether this witness was party to the same type of propaganda effort by the Communist Party.
MR. SCHERER: There has been no answer to your last question.
MR. TAVENNER: That is right; may I have a direction?
MR. SEEGER: Would you repeat the question? I don't even know what the last question was, and I thought I have answered all of them up to now.
MR. TAVENNER: What you stated was not in response to the question.
CHAIRMAN WALTER: Proceed with the questioning, Mr. Tavenner.
MR. TAVENNER: I believe, Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I will have the question read to him. I think it should be put in exactly the same form.
(Whereupon the reporter read the pending question as above recorded.)
MR. SEEGER: "These features": what do you mean? Except for the answer I have already given you, I have no answer. The answer I gave you have, don't you? That is, that I am proud that I have sung for Americans of every political persuasion, and I have never refused to sing for anybody because I disagreed with their political opinion, and I am proud of the fact that my songs seem to cut across and find perhaps a unifying thing, basic humanity, and that is why I would love to be able to tell you about these songs, because I feel that you would agree with me
more, sir. I know many beautiful songs from your home county, Carbon, and Monroe, and I hitchhiked through there and stayed in the homes of miners.

MR. TAVENNER: My question was whether or not you sang at these functions of the Communist Party. You have answered it inferentially, and if I understand your answer, you are saying you did.

MR. SEEGER: Except for that answer, I decline to answer further.

MR. TAVENNER: Did you sing at functions of the Communist Party, at Communist Party requests?

MR. SEEGER: I believe, sir, that a good twenty minutes ago, I gave my answer to this whole line of questioning.

MR. TAVENNER: Yes, but you have now beclouded your answer by your statement, and I want to make certain what you mean. Did you sing at the Communist Party functions which I have asked you about, as a Communist Party duty?

MR. SEEGER: I have already indicated that I am not interested, and I feel it is improper to say who has sung my songs or who I have sung them to, especially under such compulsion as this.

MR. TAVENNER: Have you been a member of the Communist Party since 1947?

(Witness consulted with counsel.)

MR. SEEGER: The same answer, sir.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: I direct you to answer that question.

MR. SEEGER: I must give the same answer as before.

MR. TAVENNER: I have a throwaway sheet entitled "Culture Fights Back, 1953," showing entertainment at the Capitol Hotel, Carnival Room, Fifty-first Street at Eighth Avenue, in 1953, sponsored by the Committee to Defend V. J. Jerome. It indicates that Pete Seeger was one of those furnishing the entertainment. Will you tell the Committee, please, whether or not you were asked to perform on that occasion, and whether or not you did, either as a Communist Party directive, or as what you considered to be a duty to the Communist Party?

MR. SEEGER: I believe I have answered this already.

MR. TAVENNER: Are you acquainted with V. J. Jerome?

MR. SEEGER: I have already told you, sir, that I believe my associations, whatever they are, are my own private affairs.

MR. TAVENNER: You did know, at that time, in 1953, that V. J. Jerome was a cultural head of the Communist Party and one of the Smith Act defendants in New York City?

MR. SEEGER: Again the same answer, sir.

MR. SCHERER: You refuse to answer that question?

MR. SEEGER: Yes, sir.

MR. TAVENNER: I hand you a photograph which was taken of the May Day parade in New York City in 1952, which shows the front rank of a group of individuals, and one is in a uniform with military cap and insignia, and carrying a placard entitled CENSORED. Will you examine it please and state whether or not that is a photograph of you?

(A document was handed to the witness.)

MR. SEEGER: It is like Jesus Christ when asked by Pontius Pilate, "Are you king of the Jews?"

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Stop that.

MR. SEEGER: Let someone else identify that picture.

MR. SCHERER: I ask that he be directed to answer the question.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: I direct you to answer the question.

MR. SEEGER: Do I identify this photograph?
CHAIRMAN WALTER: Yes.
MR. SEEGER: I say let someone else identify it.
MR. TAVENNER: I desire to offer the document in evidence and ask that it be marked "Seeger exhibit No.6."
CHAIRMAN WALTER: Make it a part of the record.
(Witness consulted with counsel.)
MR. TAVENNER: It is noted that the individual mentioned is wearing a military uniform. That was in May of 1952, and the statute of limitations would have run by now as to any offense for the improper wearing of the uniform, and will you tell the Committee whether or not you took part in that May Day program wearing a uniform of an American soldier?
MR. SEEGER: The same answer as before, sir.
CHAIRMAN WALTER: I direct you to answer that question.
(Witness consulted with counsel.)
MR. SCHERER: I think the record should show that the witness remains mute, following the direction by the Chairman to answer that question.
MR. SEEGER: The same answer, sir, as before.
MR. SCHERER: Again, I understand that you are not invoking the Fifth Amendment?
MR. SEEGER: That is correct.
MR. SCHERER: We are not accepting the answers or the reasons you gave.
MR. SEEGER: That is your prerogative, sir.
MR. SCHERER: Do you understand it is the feeling of the Committee that you are in contempt as a result of the position you take?
MR. SEEGER: I can't say.
MR. SCHERER: I am telling you that that is the position of the Committee.
MR. TAVENNER: The Daily Worker of April 21, 1948, at page 7, contains a notice that Pete Seeger was a participant in an affair for Ferdinand Smith. Will you tell the Committee what the occasion was at which you took part?
MR. SEEGER: I hate to waste the Committee's time, but I think surely you must realize by now that my answer is the same.
MR. TAVENNER: Do you know whether Ferdinand Smith was under deportation orders at that time?
MR. SEEGER: My answer is the same as before, sir.
MR. TAVENNER: I think that he was not under deportation orders until a little later than that.
CHAIRMAN WALTER: What is his name?
MR. TAVENNER: Ferdinand Smith, a Communist Party member and former vice-president of the maritime union. My purpose in asking you these questions, Mr. Seeger, is to determine whether or not, in accordance with the plan of the Communist Party as outlined by Mr. Kazan and Mr. George Hall, you were performing a valuable service to the Communist Party, and if that was the way they attempted to use you.
MR. SEEGER: Is that a question, sir?
MR. TAVENNER: That is my explanation to you, with the hope that you will give the Committee some light on that subject.
MR. SEEGER: No, my answer is the same as before.
MR. TAVENNER: Did you also perform and entertain at various functions held by front organizations, such as the American Youth for Democracy? I have here photostatic copies of the Daily Worker indicating such programs were conducted in Detroit in 1952, at Greenwich Village
on May 10, 1947, and again at another place in March of 1948. Did you entertain at functions under the auspices of the American Youth for Democracy?

(Witness consulted with counsel.)

MR. SEEGER: The answer is the same, and I take it that you are not interested in all of the different places that I have sung. Why don't you ask me about the churches and schools and other places?

MR. TAVENNER: That is very laudable, indeed, and I wish only that your activities had been confined to those areas. If you were acting for the Communist Party at these functions, we want to know it. We want to determine just what the Communist Party plan was.

MR. SCHERER: Witness, you have indicated that you are perfectly willing to tell us about all of these innumerable functions at which you entertained, but why do you refuse to tell us about the functions that Mr. Tavenner inquires about?

MR. SEEGER: No, sir, I said that I should be glad to tell you about all of the songs that I have sung, because I feel that the songs are the clearest explanation of what I do believe in, as a musician, and as an American.

MR. SCHERER: Didn't you just say that you sang before various religious groups, school groups?

MR. SEEGER: I have said it and I will say it again, and I have sung for perhaps-

(Witness consulted with counsel.)

MR. SCHERER: You are willing to tell us about those groups?

MR. SEEGER: I am saying voluntarily that I have sung for almost every religious group in the country, from Jewish and Catholic, and Presbyterian and Holy Rollers and Revival Churches, and I do this voluntarily. I have sung for many, many different groups-and it is hard for perhaps one person to believe, I was looking back over the twenty years or so that I have sung around these forty-eight states, that I have sung in so many different places.

MR. SCHERER: Did you sing before the groups that Mr. Tavenner asked you about?

MR. SEEGER: I am saying that my answer is the same as before. I have told you that I sang for everybody.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Wait a minute. You sang for everybody. Then are we to believe, or to take it, that you sang at the places Mr. Tavenner mentioned?

MR. SEEGER: My answer is the same as before.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: What is that?

MR. SEEGER: It seems to me like the third time I have said it, if not the fourth.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: Maybe it is the fifth, but say it again. I want to know what your answer is.

(Witness consulted with counsel.)

MR. SEEGER: I decline to discuss, under compulsion, where I have sung, and who has sung my songs, and who else has sung with me, and the people I have known. I love my country very dearly, and I greatly resent this implication that some of the places that I have sung and some of the people that I have known, and some of my opinions, whether they are religious or philosophical, or I might be a vegetarian, make me any less of an American. I will tell you about my songs, but I am not interested in telling you who wrote them, and I will tell you about my songs, and I am not interested in who listened to them.

MR. TAVENNER: According to the Daily Worker, there was a conference program of the Civil Rights Congress on April 2, 1949, at which you were one of the performers. On August 27, 1949, the People's Artists presented a summer musicale at Lakeland Acres picnic grounds,
Peekskill, New York, for the benefit of the Harlem chapter of the Civil Rights Congress, at which you were a participant. At another meeting of the Civil Rights Congress of New York, around May 11, 1946, you were a participant. Will you tell the Committee, please, under what circumstances you performed, because you have said that you sang at all sorts of meetings. Under what circumstances were your services acquired on those occasions?

MR. SEEGER: My answer is the same as before, sir. I can only infer from your lack of interest in my songs that you are actually scared to know what these songs are like, because there is nothing wrong with my songs, sir. Do you know—

MR. SCHERER: You said you want to talk about your songs, and I will give you an opportunity. Tell us what songs you sang at Communist Party meetings?

MR. SEEGER: I will tell you about the songs that I have sung any place.

MR. SCHERER: I want to know the ones that you sang at Communist Party meetings, because those are the songs about which we can inquire. Just tell us one song that you sang at a Communist Party meeting.

MR. SEEGER: Mr. Scherer, it seems to me that you heard my testimony, and that is a ridiculous question, because you know what my answer is.

MR. TAVENNER: Mr. George Hall testified that the entertainment that he engaged in, at the instance of the Communist Party, was not songs of a political character. He did say, however, that he was expected by the Communist Party to perform in order to raise money for the Communist Party. Now, did you, as Mr. Hall did, perform in order to raise money for Communist Party causes?

(Witness consulted with counsel.)

MR. SEEGER: I don't care what Mr. Hall says, and my answer is the same as before, sir.

MR. TAVENNER: That you refuse to answer?

MR. SEEGER: I have given my answer.

MR. SCHERER: Was Mr. Hall telling the truth when he told the Committee about the entertainment he engaged in at the instance of the Communist Party?

MR. SEEGER: I don't feel like discussing what Mr. Hall said.

MR. TAVENNER: The American Committee for Yugoslav Relief has been designated as a front organization. According to the October 22, 1947, issue of the Daily People's World, in California, Pete Seeger headed the list of entertainers to appear at a picnic given by the Southern California chapter of that organization. Did you participate in that program?

MR. SEEGER: If you have a hundred more photostats there, it seems silly for me to give you the same answer a hundred more times.

MR. TAVENNER: What is your answer?

MR. SEEGER: It is the same as before, sir.

MR. TAVENNER: There are various peace groups in the country which have utilized your services, are there not?

MR. SEEGER: I have sung for pacifists and I have sung for soldiers.

MR. TAVENNER: According to the Daily Worker of September 6, 1940, you were scheduled as a singer at a mass meeting of the American Peace Mobilization at Turner's Arena, in Washington, D.C. What were the circumstances under which you were requested to take part in that performance?

MR. SEEGER: My answer is the same as before, sir.

MR. TAVENNER: You were a member of the American Peace Mobilization, were you not?

MR. SEEGER: My answer is the same as before.
MR. TAVENNER: Were you not a delegate to the Chicago convention of the American Peace Mobilization on September 5, 1940?
MR. SEEGER: My answer is the same as before.
CHAIRMAN WALTER: Is that organization subversive?
MR. TAVENNER: Yes.
CHAIRMAN WALTER: What is the name of it?
MR. TAVENNER: American Peace Mobilization, and it was the beginning of these peace organizations, back in 1940. Did you take part in the American Peace Crusade program in Chicago in April of 1954?
MR. SEEGER: My answer is the same as before. Of course, I would be curious to know what you think of a song like this very great Negro spiritual, "I'm Gonna Lay Down My Sword and Shield, Down by the Riverside."
MR. TAVENNER: That is not at all responsive to my question.
MR. SEEGER: I gave you my answer before I even said that.
MR. TAVENNER: If you refuse to answer, I think that you should not make a speech.
(Witness consulted with counsel.)
MR. TAVENNER: Did you also perform a service for the California Labor School in Los Angeles by putting on musical programs there?
MR. SEEGER: My answer is the same as before, sir.
MR. TAVENNER: Did you teach in the California Labor School?
MR. SEEGER: My answer is the same as before, sir.
MR. SCHERER: I think for the record you should state whether the California Labor School has been cited.
MR. TAVENNER: It has.
MR. SCHERER: As subversive and Communist dominated?
MR. TAVENNER: Yes, it has been.
(Witness consulted with counsel.)
MR. TAVENNER: Did you also teach at the Jefferson School of Social Science here in the city of New York?
MR. SEEGER: My answer is the same as before, sir.
MR. SCHERER: I ask that you direct him to answer.
CHAIRMAN WALTER: I direct you to answer. Did you teach at the Jefferson School here at New York?
MR. SEEGER: I feel very silly having to repeat the same thing over and over again, but my answer is exactly the same as before, sir.
CHAIRMAN WALTER: Has the Jefferson School of Social Science been cited?
MR. TAVENNER: Yes, and it has been required to register under the 1950 Internal Security Act.
MR. SCHERER: There are a number of people here who taught at that school, Mr. Walter.
MR. TAVENNER: I desire to offer in evidence a photostatic copy of an article from the September 21, 1946, issue of the Daily Worker which refers to music courses at Jefferson School, and I call attention to the last sentence in the article wherein Peter Seeger is mentioned as a leader in one of the courses. * * * According to the March 18, 1948, issue of the Daily Worker, it is indicated that you would entertain at a musical presented by the Jefferson Workers' Bookshop. According to the November 25, 1948, issue of the same paper you would perform also under the auspices of the Jefferson School of Social Science. Also you were a participant in a program advertised in the Daily Worker of June 1, 1950, put on by the Jefferson School of
Social Science, and according to an issue of February 15, 1954, of the same paper, you were expected to play and lecture on songs and ballads in the Jefferson School. Will you tell the Committee, please, what were the circumstances under which you engaged in those programs, if you did?

MR. SEEGER: My answer is the same as before, sir.

MR. TAVENNER: Did you also engage in performances for the Labor Youth League in 1954?

MR. SEEGER: My answer is the same as before. Did you think that I sing propaganda songs or something?

MR. TAVENNER: In 1947, what was your connection with an organization known as People's Songs?

(Witness consulted with counsel.)

MR. SEEGER: I take the same answer as before regarding any organization or any association I have.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: What was People's Songs, Mr. Tavenner?

MR. TAVENNER: People's Songs was an organization which, according to its issue of February and March 1947, was composed of a number of persons on the board of directors who have been called before this Committee or identified by this Committee as members of the Communist Party, and the purpose of which, from information made available to the Committee, was to extend services to the Communist Party in its entertainment projects. Mr. Lee Hays was a member of the board of directors, was he not, along with you, in this organization?

(Witness consulted with counsel)

MR. SEEGER: My answer is the same as before, sir.

MR. TAVENNER: Were you not the editor of People's Songs, and a member of the board of directors in 1947?

MR. SEEGER: My answer is the same as before.

MR. TAVENNER: You were actually the national director of this organization, were you not?

MR. SEEGER: My answer is the same as before.

MR. TAVENNER: Was the organization founded by Alan Lomax?

MR. SEEGER: My answer is the same as before.

MR. TAVENNER: Was the booking agent of People's Songs an organization known as People's Artists?

MR. SEEGER: My answer is the same.

MR. TAVENNER: Will you tell the Committee, please, whether or not during the weekend of July 4, 1955, you were a member of the Communist Party?

MR. SEEGER: My answer is the same as before, sir.

MR. TAVENNER: Were you a member of the Communist Party at any time during the various entertainment features in which you were alleged to have engaged?

MR. SEEGER: My answer is the same.

MR. TAVENNER: Are you a member of the Communist Party now?

MR. SEEGER: My answer is the same.

MR. SCHERER: I ask for a direction on that question.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: I direct you to answer.

MR. SEEGER: My answer is the same as before.

MR. TAVENNER: I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN WALTER: The witness is excused.
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Appendix D: Anti-Italian political cartoons from the 1880s-1920s

Fig. D1: Anti-Italian political cartoon from The Mascot, 1883
**Fig. D2:** Political cartoon displaying an Italian immigrant as an uneducated, monkey like laborer, 1911

*A WOP*
A pound of spaghett' and a red-a bandan'
A stilett' and a corduroy suit;
Add garlic wat make for him strong a da mus'
And a talent for black-a da boot!
**Fig. D3:** Political cartoon displaying Italians as poor, disheveled, unemployed, street-side organ grinders, 1904

**Appendix E:** Photograph of Italian immigrants living/working spaces from Lewis Hine