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The Crucible: A Common Core State Standards Unit with Companion Texts

The purpose of this unit is to explore how history and social context can inform and shape literature, informational texts, and media. The major work in this unit, The Crucible, addresses the concept of sin as well as the importance of reputation and how fear can manipulate someone’s morals. Other texts in this unit explore author Arthur Miller’s motivation for writing the play, historical documents from the actual Salem Witch Trials, as well as the Red Scare and the Communist Party, which provides a historical perspective for the writing of The Crucible. Much of this unit centers on the social context of the Red Scare, as Arthur Miller wrote the play in response to Senator Joseph McCarthy’s hysterical persecution of those he suspected of Communism.

This novel unit serves as a guide to teaching The Crucible in an 11th grade classroom, but is not a comprehensive instructional plan. Teachers are encouraged to use this as a resource in planning and implementing instruction in their own classrooms. The teacher’s deep understanding of the text prior to instruction is necessary to effectively teach this unit.
The Crucible
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UNIT SELECTIONS BY GENRE

This document provides a list of literary fiction and non-fiction texts that may be used to enrich the study of *The Crucible*. The Common Core State Standards notes the importance of providing a “range of texts” in the classroom. This unit reflects a range in complexity, providing opportunities for ALL students to experience more complex texts across multiple genres, disciplines, and themes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENRE</th>
<th>THEMES/TOPICS</th>
<th>SELECTION, AUTHOR, AND READABILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literary Fiction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play</td>
<td>Hysteria, Reputation, Greed, Lust, Pride, Injustice</td>
<td><em>The Crucible</em> by Arthur Miller Lexile 1320L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>Injustice</td>
<td>“Half-Hanged Mary” by Margaret Atwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimedia, i.e. video, audio, interactive web sites, etc.</td>
<td>Bias and Propaganda, Hysteria</td>
<td>“How to Spot a Communist, Propaganda Short” <a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WNDWo-6WxbA">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WNDWo-6WxbA</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literary Informational Pieces</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay</td>
<td>Explanation of Authors Purpose</td>
<td>“Why I Wrote The Crucible: An Artist’s Answer to Politics” By Arthur Miller Flesch-Kincaid Level 12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informational Texts with History/Social Studies Connections</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biographical Essay</td>
<td>McCarthyism and how his life was turned upside down by the trials</td>
<td>&quot;Are You Now Or Were You Ever?&quot; by Arthur Miller Flesch-Kincaid Level 12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Cartoons</td>
<td>McCarthyism and Injustice</td>
<td>“It's okay – We're hunting Communists&quot;, &quot;You read books, eh?&quot;, &quot;We now have new and important evidence&quot;, &quot;I have here in my hand...&quot; by Herbert Block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Text</td>
<td>Giles Corey historically based story</td>
<td>“The Man of Iron: Giles Corey“ Flesch-Kincaid Level 8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Document</td>
<td>Court transcript of the examination of Tituba</td>
<td>“Examination of Tituba” Flesch-Kincaid Level 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Text</td>
<td>Explanation of communism and comparison: McCarthyism and witch trials</td>
<td>“What is Communism?” By Natalya King Flesch-Kincaid Level 11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informational Texts with Science Connections</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Text and excerpt</td>
<td>Inference of author’s purpose in the title of the play</td>
<td>“Crucible” Definition and introduction excerpt comparison Flesch-Kincaid Level 11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Text</td>
<td>Scientific explanation of ergotism</td>
<td>“Witchcraft or Psychedelic Trip?” by Dan from Smells Like Science Blog Flesch-Kincaid Level 12.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OTHER RECOMMENDED TEXTS

Frost, Robert. “The Mending Wall.” The ideas in The Crucible revolve how neighbors turn on one another. The theme from this poem can relate to that idea.

Mather, Cotton. “Memorable Providences, Relating to Witchcraft and Possessions.” This is a historical document written by Cotton Mather discussing the events of Salem.

Video, “Duck and Cover” [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IKqXu-5jw60](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IKqXu-5jw60) This is a historical video displaying the hysteria over the threat of nuclear war that America was experiencing in the 1950’s. It connects to communism and the cold war as well as the theme of hysteria.

Cullen, Dave. *Columbine*. This book tells a tale of two teenagers who hid deadly motives and fooled adults into thinking all was well, just as Abigail had done.

Video, “Walt Disney denies his employees are communist.” This is a video clip that shows how the examination went down with McCarthy. It could be used to compare to the way the Witch Trials were conducted. [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2av1oQEKGWo](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2av1oQEKGWo)
**THE CRUCIBLE INSTRUCTIONAL QUESTIONS ALIGNED WITH CCSS**

The purpose of this document is to provide teachers with examples of instructional questions that can be used to guide study of this play. These questions are designed to address important themes in *The Crucible*, as well as critical reading standards from the Common Core State Standards for grade 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Questions</th>
<th>Common Core State Standards for Reading Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Which of the “Seven Deadly Sins” is the most prevalent in <em>The Crucible</em>? Which “Sins” do the main characters represent most? Cite textual evidence to support your claim. (This would require a brief pre-teaching of the “Seven Deadly Sins.”)</td>
<td>RL.11-12.1 Cite strong and thorough textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text, including determining where the text leaves matters uncertain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Who is most at fault in the affair between John Proctor and Abigail Williams? Support your claim with textual evidence.</td>
<td>RL.11-12.1 Cite strong and thorough textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text, including determining where the text leaves matters uncertain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) What evidence shows that mass hysteria is at work in Salem?</td>
<td>RL.11-12.1 Cite strong and thorough textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text, including determining where the text leaves matters uncertain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) What are the overarching themes of the <em>The Crucible</em>? Cite textual evidence to support your claim. How do the themes in the play paint a picture of Puritan America?</td>
<td>RL.11-12.2 Determine two or more themes or central ideas of a text and analyze their development over the course of the text, including how they interact and build on one another to produce a complex account; provide an objective summary of the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) How is Parris characterized? What strategies does the author use to develop Parris’ character throughout the play?</td>
<td>RL.11-12.3 Analyze the impact of the author’s choices regarding how to develop and relate elements of a story or drama (e.g., where a story is set, how the action is ordered, how the characters are introduced and developed).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Trace Hale’s dynamic transformation throughout the play. Why was this change necessary to the development of the plot?</td>
<td>RL.11-12.3 Analyze the impact of the author’s choices regarding how to develop and relate elements of a story or drama (e.g., where a story is set, how the action is ordered, how the characters are introduced and developed).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Questions</td>
<td>Common Core State Standards for Reading Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) What is the connotative meaning of “I mean to please you, Elizabeth,” in Act II. What evidence shows this connotation and how does the evidence prove your hypothesis?</td>
<td>RL.11-12.4 Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in the text, including figurative and connotative meanings; analyze the impact of specific word choices on meaning and tone, including words with multiple meanings or language that is particularly fresh, engaging, or beautiful. (Include Shakespeare as well as other authors.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) What is the main climactic moment of the play? Trace the events that contribute to this climax. What impact does this moment have on the play?</td>
<td>RL.11-12.5 Analyze how an author’s choices concerning how to structure specific parts of a text (e.g., the choice of where to begin or end a story, the choice to provide a comedic or tragic resolution) contribute to its overall structure and meaning as well as its aesthetic impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) How is the play an allegory for Arthur Miller’s own struggles with McCarthyism? How is John Proctor like Arthur Miller? (The teacher will need to use companion texts with The Crucible to address this question.)</td>
<td>RL.11-12.9 Demonstrate knowledge of eighteenth-, nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century foundational works of American literature, including how two or more texts from the same period treat similar themes or topics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## VOCABULARY AND IMPLICATIONS FOR INSTRUCTION

This list reflects both academic and content words for *The Crucible*. Words were selected based on their potential for wide use in an academic setting as well as for impact on comprehension of the text. Many of the words on this list are part of a word family, which provides opportunities for discussion of prefixes, suffixes, and root words across disciplines. Teachers are encouraged to teach vocabulary within the context of the novel, and use front loading of vocabulary sparingly.

Please do not copy this list and distribute to students. It is to be used as a guide for the teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapters</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Act I</td>
<td>heathen</td>
<td>uncivilized person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>faction</td>
<td>a organized group within a larger group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>abomination</td>
<td>a shameful action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gibberish</td>
<td>meaningless talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>providence</td>
<td>a manifestation of divine direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>contenttion</td>
<td>opposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>clamored</td>
<td>loud uproar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intimations</td>
<td>hints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>formidable</td>
<td>causing fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conjuring</td>
<td>to call upon or command by a spell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>afflicted</td>
<td>mental or bodily stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>compact</td>
<td>to join together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act II</td>
<td>magistrate</td>
<td>an officer of the court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bewildered</td>
<td>confuse or puzzling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dote</td>
<td>expression of affection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>begrudge</td>
<td>envy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pious</td>
<td>showing a duty to god</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>theology</td>
<td>study of god</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ordained</td>
<td>to decree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>covenanted</td>
<td>an agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>daft</td>
<td>senseless and foolish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>calamity</td>
<td>a disaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pretense</td>
<td>pretending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act III</td>
<td>affidavit</td>
<td>a written statement in a case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>effrontery</td>
<td>boldness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deposition</td>
<td>a statement under oath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>immaculate</td>
<td>free from flaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qualm</td>
<td>uneasy feeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act IV</td>
<td>prodigious</td>
<td>wonderful and monstrous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>excommunication</td>
<td>cut off or exclude from membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>beguile</td>
<td>trick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>floundering</td>
<td>struggle clumsily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gibbet</td>
<td>gallows</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COMPANION TEXTS WITH INSTRUCTIONAL QUESTIONS ALIGNED TO CCSS

The purpose of this document is to provide teachers with examples of instructional questions that may be used to teach companion documents in this unit. These questions are designed to address important themes or ideas in each text and critical reading standards from the Common Core State Standards for grades 11-12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selections</th>
<th>Questions for Discussion</th>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Half-Hanged Mary&quot; by Margaret Atwood</td>
<td>What impact does the time line structure have on the poem's poignancy?</td>
<td>RL.11-12.5 Analyze how an author's choices concerning how to structure specific parts of a text (e.g., the choice of where to begin or end a story, the choice to provide a comedic or tragic resolution) contribute to its overall structure and meaning as well as its aesthetic impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;How to Spot a Communist, Propaganda Short&quot;</td>
<td>What persuasive appeals are evident in this clip? Why was this propaganda clip so effective in the 1950's?</td>
<td>RL.11-12.6 Determine an author's point of view or purpose in a text in which the rhetoric is particularly effective, analyzing how style and content contribute to the power, persuasiveness or beauty of the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Why I Wrote The Crucible: An Artist's Answer to Politics&quot; By Arthur Miller</td>
<td>How has Miller shown his bias throughout this essay?</td>
<td>RL.11-12.5 Analyze and evaluate the effectiveness of the structure an author uses in his or her exposition or argument, including whether the structure makes points clear, convincing, and engaging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Are You Now Or Were You Ever?&quot; by Arthur Miller</td>
<td>How does Miller develop a sense of being trapped in a world that is hysterical? What affect does this have on the meaning of the article?</td>
<td>RL.11-12.3 Analyze a complex set of ideas or sequence of events and explain how specific individuals, ideas, or events interact and develop over the course of the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;It's okay – We're hunting Communists&quot;, &quot;You read books, eh?&quot;, &quot;We now have new and important evidence&quot;, &quot;I have here in my hand . . .&quot; by Herbert Block</td>
<td>What message does Herbert Block convey of the McCarthy trials with his political cartoons? How does Block's message match Miller's portrayal of the McCarthy trial?</td>
<td>RL.11-12.7 Integrate and evaluate multiple sources of information presented in different media or formats (e.g., visually, quantitatively) as well as in words in order to address a question or solve a problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selections</td>
<td>Questions for Discussion</td>
<td>Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Man of Iron: Giles Corey&quot;</td>
<td>Why might some consider Giles Corey a hero in the Salem Witch Trials? What textual evidence illustrates this heroic behavior?</td>
<td>RI.11-12.1 Cite strong and thorough textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text, including determining where the text leaves matters uncertain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Examination of Tituba&quot;</td>
<td>What does this historical document reveal about the court of the 17th century?</td>
<td>RI.11-12.9 Analyze seventeenth-, eighteenth-, and nineteenth-century foundational U.S. documents of historical and literary significance (including The Declaration of Independence, the Preamble to the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and Lincoln’s Second Inaugural Address) for their themes, purposes, and rhetorical features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;What is Communism?&quot; By Natalya King</td>
<td>Provide an objective description of communism discussing both the pros and cons of the party.</td>
<td>RI.11-12.2 Determine two or more central ideas of a text and analyze their development over the course of the text, including how they interact and build on one another to provide a complex analysis; provide an objective summary of the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Crucible&quot; Definition and introduction excerpt comparison</td>
<td>Based upon these texts, why did Arthur Miller use <em>The Crucible</em> as the title for his play?</td>
<td>RI.11-12.7 Integrate and evaluate multiple sources of information presented in different media or formats (e.g., visually, quantitatively) as well as in words in order to address a question or solve a problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Witchcraft or Psychedelic Trip?&quot; by Dan from Smells Like Science Blog</td>
<td>Write a functional definition of &quot;ergotism&quot; and explain, using textual evidence from the article, why it is a viable explanation of the hysteria in Salem.</td>
<td>RI.11-12.4 Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in a text, including figurative, connotative, and technical meanings; analyze how an author uses and refines the meaning of a key term or terms over the course of a text (e.g., how Madison defines faction in Federalist No. 10).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CCSS LEARNING TASKS FOR *THE CRUCIBLE* UNIT

This document reflects the different types of learning activities which can be used to teach reading, writing, speaking, listening, and language standards from the CCSS with documents in this unit. It is not an all-inclusive list, but it does reflect a range of approaches and strategies which can be used to scaffold learning for ALL of our students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Questions</th>
<th>Activities and Extensions</th>
<th>Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Which of the Seven Deadly Sins is the most prevalent in <em>The Crucible</em>? Which Sins do the main characters represent most? Cite textual evidence to support your claim. (This would require a brief pre-teaching of what the Seven Deadly Sins are.)</td>
<td>After the teacher pre-teaches the Seven Deadly Sins, students are split into seven groups. They pull a Deadly Sin card. Students must prove through textual evidence that their sin is the most prominent in the play. Students present their proof. The class then evaluates the evidence and comes to a consensus on the most significant sin. After that, the same process can be done with a character analysis in mind. Assign each group a character and have them cite evidence to prove of which sins they are guilty. Students present their findings to the class. The class evaluates which character is most guilty of which sin.</td>
<td>RL.1 Cite strong and thorough textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text, including determining where the text leaves matters uncertain. W.1 Write arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts, using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence. SL.1 Initiate and participate effectively in a range of collaborative discussions (one-on-one, in groups, and teacher-led) with diverse partners on grades 11–12 topics, texts, and issues, building on others’ ideas and expressing their own clearly and persuasively. SL.3 Evaluate a speaker’s point of view, reasoning, and use of evidence and rhetoric, assessing the stance, premises, links among ideas, word choice, points of emphasis, and tone used. SL.4 Present information, findings, and supporting evidence, conveying a clear and distinct perspective, such that listeners can follow the line of reasoning, alternative or opposing perspectives are addressed, and the organization, development, substance, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Questions</td>
<td>Activities and Extensions</td>
<td>Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is most at fault in the affair between John Proctor and Abigail Williams? Support your claim with textual evidence.</td>
<td>Students create a three-column chart with one column for each of the three characters: Abigail, John and Elizabeth. In each character's column, the students provide textual evidence to prove who is most at fault for the affair. After coming up with their evidence, which might be done in groups, students individually write a short essay detailing which character is most at fault and why. In this argument, students are expected to explain why the other two are not as responsible.</td>
<td>RL.1 Cite strong and thorough textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text, including determining where the text leaves matters uncertain. W.11-12.1 Write arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts, using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence. SL.11-12.1 Initiate and participate effectively in a range of collaborative discussions (one-on-one, in groups, and teacher-led) with diverse partners on grades 11–12 topics, texts, and issues, building on others’ ideas and expressing their own clearly and persuasively. SL.11-12.3 Evaluate a speaker’s point of view, reasoning, and use of evidence and rhetoric, assessing the stance, premises, links among ideas, word choice, points of emphasis, and tone used. SL.11-12.4 Present information, findings, and supporting evidence, conveying a clear and distinct perspective, such that listeners can follow the line of reasoning, alternative or opposing perspectives are addressed, and the organization, development, substance, and style are appropriate to purpose, audience, and a range of formal and informal tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Questions</td>
<td>Activities and Extensions</td>
<td>Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is the play an allegory for Arthur Miller’s own struggles with McCarthyism? How is John Proctor like Arthur Miller?</td>
<td>Students read the following two texts discussing each using the instructional questions previously mentioned: “Why I Wrote The Crucible: An Artist’s Answer to Politics” and “Are You Now Or Were You Ever?” by Arthur Miller. As they read the articles, they will make a concrete/abstract chart of important information. A concrete/abstract chart consists of two columns labeled “concrete” and “abstract.” The concrete column is filled with quotations or paraphrasing. The abstract column relates analysis of the items in the concrete column. After reading the play, students use their knowledge from the two articles and the play to formulate an essay to answer this instructional question as a prompt: How is the play an allegory for Arthur Miller’s own struggles with McCarthyism?</td>
<td>RI.11-12.7 Integrate and evaluate multiple sources of information presented in different media or formats (e.g., visually, quantitatively) as well as in words in order to address a question or solve a problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What does this historical document reveal about the court of the 17th century?</td>
<td>Students read “Examination of Tituba” and in pairs answer the instructional question: What does this historical document reveal about the court of the 17th century? They then view the video: “Walt Disney denies his</td>
<td>RI.11-12.9 Demonstrate knowledge of eighteenth-, nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century foundational works of American literature, including how two or more texts from the same period treat similar themes or topics. RI.11-12.5 Analyze and evaluate the effectiveness of the structure an author uses in his or her exposition or argument, including whether the structure makes points clear, convincing, and engaging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) hearings similar to the 17th century hearing?</td>
<td>SL.11-12.1 Initiate and participate effectively in a range of collaborative discussions (one-on-one, in groups, and teacher-led) with diverse partners on grades 11–12 topics, texts, and issues, building on others’ ideas and expressing their own clearly and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Questions</td>
<td>Activities and Extensions</td>
<td>Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What does this reveal about the nature of hysteria? Where</td>
<td>employees are communist.” <a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch">http://www.youtube.com/watch</a> ?v=2av1oQEGW8o</td>
<td>SL.11-12.2 Integrate multiple sources of information presented in diverse formats and media (e.g., visually, quantitatively, orally) in order to make informed decisions and solve problems, evaluating the credibility and accuracy of each source and noting any discrepancies among the data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>else in history or literature have you seen this type of</td>
<td>They would answer the instructional question: How are theHUAC hearings similar to the 17th century hearing?</td>
<td>RI.11-12.7 Integrate and evaluate multiple sources of information presented in different media or formats (e.g., visually, quantitatively) as well as in words in order to address a question or solve a problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hysteria? How does this apply to The Crucible?</td>
<td>In pairs, the students answer the remaining instructional questions.</td>
<td>RI.11-12.8 Delineate and evaluate the reasoning in seminal U.S. texts, including the application of constitutional principles and use of legal reasoning (e.g., in U.S. Supreme Court majority opinions and dissents) and the premises, purposes, and arguments in works of public advocacy (e.g., The Federalist, presidential addresses).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students share out to the class and discuss.</td>
<td>RI.11-12.9 Analyze seventeenth-, eighteenth-, and nineteenth-century foundational U.S. documents of historical and literary significance (including The Declaration of Independence, the Preamble to the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and Lincoln’s Second Inaugural Address) for their themes, purposes, and rhetorical features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why is Hale’s dynamic transformation necessary to the</td>
<td>In small groups, students track Hale’s decisions and their consequences in a timeline of</td>
<td>RL.11-12.3 Analyze the impact of the author’s choices regarding how to develop and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development of the plot?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Questions</td>
<td>Activities and Extensions</td>
<td>Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>images and quotes.</td>
<td>relate elements of a story or drama (e.g., where a story is set, how the action is ordered, how the characters are introduced and developed).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using this timeline, students prepare and present an argument as to why this change in character is necessary to the plot.</td>
<td>W.11-12.1 Write arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts, using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested format: multimedia presentation</td>
<td>SL.11-12.1 Initiate and participate effectively in a range of collaborative discussions (one-on-one, in groups, and teacher-led) with diverse partners on grades 11–12 topics, texts, and issues, building on others’ ideas and expressing their own clearly and persuasively.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL.11-12.3 Evaluate a speaker’s point of view, reasoning, and use of evidence and rhetoric, assessing the stance, premises, links among ideas, word choice, points of emphasis, and tone used.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL.11-12.4 Present information, findings, and supporting evidence, conveying a clear and distinct perspective, such that listeners can follow the line of reasoning, alternative or opposing perspectives are addressed, and the organization, development, substance, and style are appropriate to purpose, audience, and a range of formal and informal tasks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do the multiple climactic moments contribute to the overall impact of the play?</td>
<td>As a class, students identify the multiple climactic moments in the play. In small groups, RL.3 Analyze the impact of the author’s choices regarding how to develop and relate elements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Questions</td>
<td>Activities and Extensions</td>
<td>Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the main climactic moment of the play?</td>
<td>students evaluate to determine which specific event in the play is the most important climactic moment. Students make a case for their theory in a cause and effect chart. Students trace the rising action of the play to their theorized climax. Students present their theory and chart to the class.</td>
<td>of a story or drama (e.g., where a story is set, how the action is ordered, how the characters are introduced and developed). RL.11-12.5 Analyze how an author’s choices concerning how to structure specific parts of a text (e.g., the choice of where to begin or end a story, the choice to provide a comedic or tragic resolution) contribute to its overall structure and meaning as well as its aesthetic impact. W.11-12.1 Write arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts, using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence. SL.11-12.1 Initiate and participate effectively in a range of collaborative discussions (one-on-one, in groups, and teacher-led) with diverse partners on grades 11–12 topics, texts, and issues, building on others’ ideas and expressing their own clearly and persuasively. SL.11-12.3 Evaluate a speaker’s point of view, reasoning, and use of evidence and rhetoric, assessing the stance, premises, links among ideas, word choice, points of emphasis, and tone used. SL.11-12.4 Present information, findings, and supporting evidence, conveying a clear and distinct perspective, such that listeners can follow the line of reasoning, alternative or opposing perspectives are addressed, and the organization,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Questions</td>
<td>Activities and Extensions</td>
<td>Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>development, substance, and style are appropriate to purpose, audience, and a range of formal and informal tasks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MARK: I just come from the farm, the whole country's talking about breadlessness. She is so energetic, a subservient, naive girl.

MERELY: Oh, I seel (Feels back on bed,进入 Mary Warren)

ABIGAIL: He saw you naked.

MERELY: And what more?

we danced—I told him as much already.

ABIGAIL: Now look, if they be asgraphing us, tell them dead one since last night.

MERELY: I t's wretched. I know not—the scenes, the scenes, the scenes like a

RUTH: Uncle, I know not—she seems so walk like a

PARRISS: If she stands for the window, cry for me at once.

EXCERPT FROM ACT ONE OF THE CRUCIBLE

Leon County Schools

Study in my classroom should always include these two areas:
continuous to support the observation that vocabulary and syntax are two of the primary obstacles to comprehension. Document this document provides an example of text dependent questions for a passage from The Crucible. Questions should always be

Text Dependent Questions Example
Maycross up and out. My wife is waiting with your word.

Professor: Do you foolish, Mary. What? Be you deaf?

(Here of course, in the hands.) (Enter John Prof.)

Henry; yes, and roughly she up. Now you... sit up and stop.

Henry; yes, yes. He goes to Betty. With the side of bed. D's.

Can you make you wish you had never seen the sun go down.
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ABIGAIL: John—I am waiting for you, ever, nightly.

PROCTOR: I come to see what mischief your uncle's breeding,

ABIGAIL: What's this? I want no talk of you tonight.

PROCTOR: (Banging his way at door.) Give me a word, John, a

Brief word.

ABIGAIL: The stocks before you, as I say.

PROCTOR: (As he's crossing to door.) D'amain, by

night, and my uncle leaped in on us. She took flight; it all,

ABIGAIL: O, yes; we were dancin' in the woods last

afternoon, the town's mumblin' withal.

PROCTOR: The road past my house is a pathway to Salem.

ABIGAIL: With a vacant laugh. Oh, John, since you're not

believein' she's here,

PROCTOR: So she lies, eh? Where are her wings?

ABIGAIL: She's only gone silly, somehow; she'll come out of

Prospero's Bleak-house; Abigail has stood abashing this

watch; Good morning, Master Proctor. (Mary slides out

of door relationship.) I'd best be off; I have my letter to

Mercy; Rising, crossing to entrance. Tillett's Belling aware.
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PROCTOR: (Shakes her.) Do you look for whipping?

What does she imply?

What impact does Abigail's words have on John Proctor?

PROCTOR: (Coily, cradling her wrists.) You'll speak sticky, wise.

Abigail: With a nectar. (Oh, I marvel how such a touched Abby.)

Again, Abby! Well out of mind—(takes her arms.) we never

heard her thus—tell me exactly how long before I first ever reach for

you, Abby. I may think of you softly from time to time—

PROCTOR: As if a persons off-stage begin a quiet chant—

Abigail: (With a flash of anger, throwing his hands off.)

How do you call me child?

PROCTOR: (Tucking her hands.) Child.

Do now!

Your face when she put me out and you loved me then and you

housed and sweetened like a stallion whenever I come near! I say

Abigail: I know how you cliched my back behind your

The Crucible
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How has Abigail's tone now shifted? Why did the author choose to have this shift happen?

Enter.

Beryda drops her ears suddenly, and whines loudly. Parts of words—such as heard in the psalm—the song outside—she rushes to door. blocks in. John, piy me, pwy me! The Huns suddenly go out. wherever she is. you love me. What did the author do?
Appendix

Companion Texts for *The Crucible*
the profound black sky of your face.
Winning yourross across
bleeding hearts of
are the dead angels
faith, charity, and hope
I hurt, therefore I am
Does my twisting body spell out grace?

What matters is the rope?
if nature is your orbipel
more than indifferent trees
like a lighthouse, watches from his
is it my choice that I'm dangling

The one about the tree will
we can continue our quarrel
at the new level.
begetting, being work
away from the daily
with maybe some time to kill
Well God, now I'm up here

Tomp

To go around; you need it all.
knows there isn't much
a good work, lord,
absent the cold.
anything a hand, a piece of bread, ashawl
I understand, you can't spare

The men of the town strike homeward when once took blood in return for food.
old bone-faced, bedecked, old original

a blackened apple stuck back into the tree.
Up I go like a windmill in reverse.
With time they heard my thought of axes.
The rope was an improvisation.

Tomp

Those come in handy.
Wherever there's talk of demons and a sweet peach hidden in my body.

Oh yes, and breasts,
and a suitable cure for warts.

a weedy arm in my own name,
tender skin, few emotions.
for having these eyes and an unburned skin.
I was hanged for living alone.

Over a town house.
clothes over it water.
I didn't feel the searched flesh.
I didn't feel the armed word hit.
I was mulling the cow.

Running was loose in the air.

Tomp

Fourteen years.

According to one of the several surviving accounts, she was left behind. It is known that when she was cut down she was still alive, since she lived for another

"Half-Handed Mary" was Mary Webster, who was accused of witchcraft in the 1680's in a Puritan town in Massachusetts and hanged from a tree. Where,

"Half-Handed Mary" by Margaret Atwood
I will not live in hold onto me acknowledge leaves and wind a child I will not bear I will be born this is no crime I was born I have borne I on you as witness I did tell me there is only one prayer it is not a mine are as mine are as ever asked 'b难怪 the sky is blue shining like holy polynina' on the ground is cool I'm close...
The words boil out of me.

Who else has been dead twice?

Because who the hell else could understand

The words boil out of me.

my audience is God.

My audience is His.

I speak in tongues.

like lovely cadillacs.

glimmer and burst in my wake

and gel the thanks, blasphemies

two forms of the same thing. I eat mice.

I eat peppers and a duck.

Holiness beams on my dirty fingers.

I can now say anything I can say.

Having been hanged for something.

No one crosses that circle.

medallion of my navel

an aphorism giggles.

Why first death am I my head,

To get out of my way.

The townshold drunkard first into the bushes

purple berries.

mouthful of justice addicted

ruminating to myself the crazy.

a letter minus.

a letter minus.

around my true body.

My body of skin waxs and wanes

Later

But now I am one.

Before, I was not a witch.

and turn tell

standing in the fowledead

They see their own will

out at them through my sky-blue eyes.

Now I only need to look

You can imagine how that went over.

I am a thirty year.

and bared my teeth at them.

I fell to the clover, breached it in,

for the same thing. How nice.

You can't execute me twice

I know the law.

Touch lock folks.

I was still alive.

surprise. surprise.

cutt my body from the rope.

(open your mouth, close your eyes)

When they came to harvest my corpse
“Why I Wrote *The Crucible*: An Artist’s Answer to Politics” By Arthur Miller

As I watched "The Crucible" taking shape as a movie over much of the past year, the sheer depth of time that it represents for me kept returning to mind. As those powerful actors blossomed on the screen, and the children and the horses, the crowds and the wagons, I thought again about how I came to cook all this up nearly fifty years ago, in an America almost nobody I know seems to remember clearly. In a way, there is a biting irony in this film's having been made by a Hollywood studio, something unimaginable in the fifties. But there they are--Daniel Day-Lewis (John Proctor) scything his sea-bordered field, Joan Allen (Elizabeth) lying pregnant in the frigid jail, Winona Ryder (Abigail) stealing her minister-uncle's money, majestic Paul Scofield (Judge Danforth) and his righteous empathy with the Devil-possessed children, and all of them looking as inevitable as rain.

I remember those years—they formed "The Crucible"'s skeleton—but I have lost the dead weight of the fear I had then. Fear doesn't travel well; just as it can warp judgment, its absence can diminish memory's truth. What terrifies one generation is likely to bring only a puzzled smile to the next. I remember how in 1964, only twenty years after the war, Harold Clurman, the director of "Incident at Vichy," showed the cast a film of a Hitler speech, hoping to give them a sense of the Nazi period in which my play took place. They watched as Hitler, facing a vast stadium full of adoring people, went up on his toes in ecstasy, hands clasped under his chin, a sublimely self-gratified grin on his face, his body swivelling rather cutely, and they giggled at his overacting.

Likewise, films of Senator Joseph McCarthy are rather unsettling—if you remember the fear he once spread. Buzzing his truculent sidewalk brawler's snarl through the hairs in his nose, squinting through his cat's eyes and sneering like a villain, he comes across now as nearly comical, a self-aware performer keeping a straight face as he does his juicy threat-shtick.

McCarthy's power to stir fears of creeping Communism was not entirely based on illusion, of course; the paranoid, real or pretended, always secretes its pearl around a grain of fact. From being our wartime ally, the Soviet Union rapidly became an expanding empire. In 1949, Mao Zedong took power in China. Western Europe also seemed ready to become Red—especially Italy, where the Communist Party was the largest outside Russia, and was growing. Capitalism, in the opinion of many, myself included, had nothing more to say, its final poisoned bloom having been Italian and German Fascism. McCarthy—brash and ill-mannered but to many authentic and true—boiled it all down to what anyone could understand: we had "lost China" and would soon lose Europe as well, because the State Department—staffed, of course, under Democratic Presidents—was full of treasonous pro-Soviet intellectuals. It was as simple as that.

If our losing China seemed the equivalent of a flea's losing an elephant, it was still a phrase—and a conviction—that one did not dare to question; to do so was to risk drawing suspicion on oneself. Indeed, the State Department proceeded to hound and fire the officers who knew China, its language, and its opaque culture—a move that suggested the practitioners of sympathetic magic who wring the neck of a doll in order to make a distant enemy's head drop off. There was magic all around; the politics of alien
conspiracy soon dominated political discourse and bid fair to wipe out any other issue. How could one deal with such enormities in a play?

"The Crucible" was an act of desperation. Much of my desperation branched out, I suppose, from a typical Depression-era trauma—the blow struck on the mind by the rise of European Fascism and the brutal anti-Semitism it had brought to power. But by 1950, when I began to think of writing about the hunt for Reds in America, I was motivated in some great part by the paralysis that had set in among many liberals who, despite their discomfort with the inquisitors' violations of civil rights, were fearful, and with good reason, of being identified as covert Communists if they should protest too strongly.

In any play, however trivial, there has to be a still point of moral reference against which to gauge the action. In our lives, in the late nineteen-forties and early nineteen-fifties, no such point existed anymore. The left could not look straight at the Soviet Union's abrogations of human rights. The anti-Communist liberals could not acknowledge the violations of those rights by congressional committees. The far right, meanwhile, was licking up all the cream. The days of "J'accuse" were gone, for anyone needs to feel right to declare someone else wrong. Gradually, all the old political and moral reality had melted like a Dali watch. Nobody but a fanatic, it seemed, could really say all that he believed.

President Truman was among the first to have to deal with the dilemma, and his way of resolving itself having to trim his sails before the howling gale on the right-turned out to be momentous. At first, he was outraged at the allegation of widespread Communist infiltration of the government and called the charge of "coddling Communists" a red herring dragged in by the Republicans to bring down the Democrats. But such was the gathering power of raw belief in the great Soviet plot that Truman soon felt it necessary to institute loyalty boards of his own.

The Red hunt, led by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and by McCarthy, was becoming the dominating fixation of the American psyche. It reached Hollywood when the studios, after first resisting, agreed to submit artists' names to the House Committee for "clearing" before employing them. This unleashed a veritable holy terror among actors, directors, and others, from Party members to those who had had the merest brush with a front organization.

The Soviet plot was the hub of a great wheel of causation; the plot justified the crushing of all nuance, all the shadings that a realistic judgment of reality requires. Even worse was the feeling that our sensitivity to this onslaught on our liberties was passing from us—indeed, from me. In "Timebends," my autobiography, I recalled the time I'd written a screenplay ("The Hook") about union corruption on the Brooklyn waterfront. Harry Cohn, the head of Columbia Pictures, did something that would once have been considered unthinkable: he showed my script to the F.B.I. Cohn then asked me to take the gangsters in my script, who were threatening and murdering their opponents, and simply change them to Communists. When I declined to commit this idiocy (Joe Ryan, the head of the longshoremen's union, was soon to go to Sing Sing for racketeering), I got a wire from Cohn saying, "The minute we try to make the script pro-American you pull out." By then—it was 1951— I had come to accept this terribly serious insanity as routine, but there was an element of the marvelous in it which I longed to put on the stage.
In those years, our thought processes were becoming so magical, so paranoid, that to imagine writing a play about this environment was like trying to pick one’s teeth with a ball of wool: I lacked the tools to illuminate miasma. Yet I kept being drawn back to it.

I had read about the witchcraft trials in college, but it was not until I read a book published in 1867—a two-volume, thousand-page study by Charles W. Upham, who was then the mayor of Salem—that I knew I had to write about the period. Upham had not only written a broad and thorough investigation of what was even then an almost lost chapter of Salem’s past but opened up to me the details of personal relationships among many participants in the tragedy.

I visited Salem for the first time on a dismal spring day in 1952; it was a sidetracked town then, with abandoned factories and vacant stores. In the gloomy courthouse there I read the transcripts of the witchcraft trials of 1692, as taken down in a primitive shorthand by ministers who were spelling each other. But there was one entry in Upham in which the thousands of pieces I had come across were jogged into place. It was from a report written by the Reverend Samuel Parris, who was one of the chief instigators of the witch-hunt. "During the examination of Elizabeth Proctor, Abigail Williams and Ann Putnam"—the two were "afflicted" teen-age accusers, and Abigail was Parris’s niece—"both made offer to strike at said Procter; but when Abigail’s hand came near, it opened, whereas it was made up, into a fist before, and came down exceeding lightly as it drew near to said Procter, and at length, with open and extended fingers, touched Procter’s hood very lightly. Immediately Abigail cried out her fingers, her fingers, her fingers burned ..."

In this remarkably observed gesture of a troubled young girl, I believed, a play became possible. Elizabeth Proctor had been the orphaned Abigail’s mistress, and they had lived together in the same small house until Elizabeth fired the girl. By this time, I was sure, John Proctor had bedded Abigail, who had to be dismissed most likely to appease Elizabeth. There was bad blood between the two women now. That Abigail started, in effect, to condemn Elizabeth to death with her touch, then stopped her hand, then went through with it, was quite suddenly the human center of all this turmoil.

All this I understood. I had not approached the witchcraft out of nowhere or from purely social and political considerations. My own marriage of twelve years was teetering and I knew more than I wished to know about where the blame lay. That John Proctor the sinner might overturn his paralyzing personal guilt and become the most forthright voice against the madness around him was a reassurance to me, and, I suppose, an inspiration: it demonstrated that a clear moral outcry could still spring even from an ambiguously unblemished soul. Moving crabwise across the profusion of evidence, I sensed that I had at last found something of myself in it, and a play began to accumulate around this man.

But as the dramatic form became visible, one problem remained unyielding: so many practices of the Salem trials were similar to those employed by the congressional committees that I could easily be accused of skewing history for a mere partisan purpose. Inevitably, it was no sooner known that my new play was about Salem than I had to confront the charge that such an analogy was specious—that there never were any witches but there certainly are Communists. In the seventeenth century, however, the existence of witches was never questioned by the loftiest minds in Europe and America; and even
lawyers of the highest eminence, like Sir Edward Coke, a veritable hero of liberty for defending the common law against the king's arbitrary power, believed that witches had to be prosecuted mercilessly. Of course, there were no Communists in 1692, but it was literally worth your life to deny witches or their powers, given the exhortation in the Bible, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live." There had to be witches in the world or the Bible lied. Indeed, the very structure of evil depended on Lucifer's plotting against God. (And the irony is that klatches of Luciferians exist all over the country today, there may even be more of them now than there are Communists.)

As with most humans, panic sleeps in one unlighted corner of my soul. When I walked at night along the empty, wet streets of Salem in the week that I spent there, I could easily work myself into imagining my terror before a gaggle of young girls flying down the road screaming that somebody's "familiar spirit" was chasing them. This anxiety-laden leap backward over nearly three centuries may have been helped along by a particular Upham footnote. At a certain point, the high court of the province made the fatal decision to admit, for the first time, the use of "spectral evidence" as proof of guilt. Spectral evidence, so aptly named, meant that if I swore that you had sent out your "familiar spirit" to choke, tickle, poison me or my cattle, or to control thoughts and actions, I could get you hanged unless you confessed to having had contact with the Devil. After all, only the Devil could lend such powers of visible transport to confederates, in his everlasting plot to bring down Christianity.

Naturally, the best proof of the sincerity of your confession was your naming others whom you had seen in the Devil company--an invitation to private vengeance, but made official by the seal of the theocratic state. It was as though the court had grown tired of thinking and had invited in the instincts: spectral evidence--that poisoned cloud of paranoid fantasy--made a kind of lunatic sense to them, as it did in plot-ridden 1952, when so often the question was not the acts of an accused but the thoughts and intentions in his alienated mind.

The breathtaking circularity of the process had a kind of poetic tightness. Not everybody was accused, after all, so there must be some reason why you were. By denying that there is any reason whatsoever for you to be accused, you are implying, by virtue of a surprisingly small logical leap, that mere chance picked you out, which in turn implies that the Devil might not really be at work in the village or, God forbid, even exist. Therefore, the investigation itself is either mistaken or a fraud. You would have to be a crypto-Luciferian to say that--not a great idea if I you wanted to go back to your farm.

The more I read into the Salem panic, the more it touched off corresponding ages of common experiences in the fifties: the old friend of a blacklisted person crossing the street to avoid being seen talking to him; the overnight conversions of former leftists into born-again patriots; and so on. Apparently, certain processes are universal. When Gentiles in Hitler's Germany, for example, saw their Jewish neighbors being trucked off, or rs in Soviet Ukraine saw the Kulaks sing before their eyes, the common reaction, even among those unsympathetic to Nazism or Communism, was quite naturally to turn away in fear of being identified with the condemned. As I learned from non-Jewish refugees, however there was often a despairing pity mixed with "Well, they must have done something." Few of us can easily surrender our belief that society must somehow make sense. The thought that the state
has lost its mind and is punishing so many innocent people is intolerable. And so the evidence has to be internally denied.

I was also drawn into writing "The Crucible" by the chance it gave me to use a new language—that of seventeenth-century New England. That plain, craggy English was liberating in a strangely sensuous way, with its swings from an almost legalistic precision to a wonderful metaphoric richness. "The Lord doth terrible things amongst us, by lengthening the chain of the roaring lion in an extraordinary manner, so that the Devil is come down in great wrath," Deodat Lawson, one of the great witch-hunting preachers, said in a sermon. Lawson rallied his congregation for what was to be nothing less than a religious war against the Evil One—"Arm, arm, arm!"—and his concealed anti-Christian accomplices.

But it was not yet my language, and among other strategies to make it mine I enlisted the help of a former University of Michigan classmate, the Greek-American scholar and poet Kimon Friar. (He later translated Kazantzakis.) The problem was not to imitate the archaic speech but to try to create a new echo of it which would flow freely off American actors' tongues. As in the film, nearly fifty years later, the actors in the first production grabbed the language and ran with it as happily as if it were their customary speech.

"The Crucible" took me about a year to write. With its five sets and a cast of twenty-one, it never occurred to me that it would take a brave man to produce it on Broadway, especially given the prevailing climate, but Kermit Bloomgarden never faltered. Well before the play opened, a strange tension had begun to build. Only two years earlier, the "Death of a Salesman" touring company had played to a thin crowd in Peoria, Illinois, having been boycotted nearly to death by the American Legion and the Jaycees. Before that, the Catholic War Veterans had prevailed upon the Army not to allow its theatrical groups to perform, first, "All My Sons," and then any play of mine, in occupied Europe. The Dramatists Guild refused to protest attacks on a new play by Sean O'Casey, a self-declared Communist, which forced its producer to cancel his option. I knew of two suicides by actors depressed by upcoming investigation, and every day seemed to bring news of people exiling themselves to Europe: Charlie Chaplin, the director Joseph Losey, Jules Dassin, the harmonica virtuoso Larry Adler, Donald Ogden Stewart, one of the most sought-after screenwriters in Hollywood, and Sam Wanamaker, who would lead the successful campaign to rebuild the Old Globe Theatre on the Thames.

On opening night, January 22, 1953, I knew that the atmosphere would be pretty hostile. The coldness of the crowd was not a surprise; Broadway audiences were not famous for loving history lessons, which is what they made of the play. It seems to me entirely appropriate that on the day the play opened, a newspaper headline read "ALL 13 REDS GUILTY"—a story about American Communists who faced prison for "conspiring to teach and advocate the duty and necessity of forcible overthrow of government." Meanwhile, the remoteness of the production was guaranteed by the director, Jed Harris, who insisted that this was a classic requiring the actors to face front, never each other. The critics were not swept away. "Arthur Miller is a problem playwright in both senses of the word," wrote Walter Kerr of the Herald Tribune, who called the play "a step backward into mechanical parable." The Times was not much kinder, saying, "There is too much excitement and not enough emotion in "The Crucible." But the play's future would turn out quite differently.
About a year later, a new production, one with younger, less accomplished actors, working in the Martinique Hotel ballroom, played with the fervor that the script and the times required, and "The Crucible" became a hit. The play stumbled into history, and today, I am told, it is one of the most heavily demanded trade-fiction paperbacks in this country; the Bantam and Penguin editions have sold more than six million copies. I don't think there has been a week in the past forty-odd years when it hasn't been on a stage somewhere in the world. Nor is the new screen version the first. Jean-Paul Sartre, in his Marxist phase, wrote a French film adaptation that blamed the tragedy on the rich landowners conspiring to persecute the poor. (In truth, most of those who were hanged in Salem were people of substance, and two or three were very large landowners.)

It is only a slight exaggeration to say that, especially in Latin America, "The Crucible" starts getting produced wherever a political coup appears imminent, or a dictatorial regime has just been overthrown. From Argentina to Chile to Greece, Czechoslovakia, China, and a dozen other places, the play seems to present the same primeval structure of human sacrifice to the furies of fanaticism and paranoia that goes on repeating itself forever as though imbedded in the brain of social man.

I am not sure what "The Crucible" is telling people now, but I know that its paranoid center is still pumping out the same darkly attractive warning that it did in the fifties. For some, the play seems to be about the dilemma of relying on the testimony of small children accusing adults of sexual abuse, something I'd not have dreamed of forty years ago. For others, it may simply be a fascination with the outbreak of paranoia that suffuses the play--the blind panic that, in our age, often seems to sit at the dim edges of consciousness. Certainly its political implications are the central issue for many people; the Salem interrogations turn out to be eerily exact models of those yet to come in Stalin's Russia, Pinochet's Chile, Mao's China, and other regimes. (Nien Cheng, the author of "Life and Death in Shanghai," has told me that she could hardly believe that a non-Chinese--someone who had not experienced the Cultural Revolution--had written the play.) But below its concerns with justice the play evokes a lethal brew of illicit sexuality, fear of the supernatural, and political manipulation, a combination not unfamiliar these days. The film, by reaching the broad American audience as no play ever can, may well unearth still other connections to those buried public terrors that Salem first announced on this continent.

One thing more--something wonderful in the old sense of that word. I recall the weeks I spent reading testimony by the tome, commentaries, broadsides, confessions, and accusations. And always the crucial damning event was the signing of one's name in "the Devil's book." This Faustian agreement to hand over one's soul to the dreaded Lord of Darkness was the ultimate insult to God. But what were these new inductees supposed to have done once they'd signed on? Nobody seems even to have thought to ask. But, of course, actions are as irrelevant during cultural and religious wars as they are in nightmares. The thing at issue is buried intentions--the secret allegiances of the alienated hearts always the main threat to the theocratic mind, as well as its immemorial quarry.
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It would probably never have occurred to me to write a play about the Salem witch trials of 1692 had I not seen some astonishing correspondences with that calamity in the America of the late 40s and early 50s. My basic need was to respond to a phenomenon which, with only small exaggeration, one could say paralyzed a whole generation and in a short time dried up the habits of trust and toleration in public discourse.

I refer to the anti-communist rage that threatened to reach hysterical proportions and sometimes did. I can't remember anyone calling it an ideological war, but I think now that that is what it amounted to. I suppose we rapidly passed over anything like a discussion or debate, and into something quite different, a hunt not just for subversive people, but for ideas and even a suspect language. The object was to destroy the least credibility of any and all ideas associated with socialism and communism, whose proponents were assumed to be either knowing or unwitting agents of Soviet subversion.

An ideological war is like guerrilla war, since the enemy is an idea whose proponents are not in uniform but are disguised as ordinary citizens, a situation that can scare a lot of people to death. To call the atmosphere paranoid is not to say that there was nothing real in the American-Soviet stand-off. But if there was one element that lent the conflict a tone of the inauthentic and the invented, it was the swiftness with which all values were forced in months to reverse themselves.

Death of a Salesman opened in February 1949 and was hailed by nearly every newspaper and magazine. Several movie studios wanted it and finally Columbia Pictures bought it, and engaged a great actor, Frederick March, to play Willy [the central character].

In two years or less, with the picture finished, I was asked by a terrified Columbia to sign an anti-communist declaration to ward off picket lines which the rightwing American Legion was threatening to throw across the entrances of theatres showing the film. In the phone calls that followed, the air of panic was heavy. It was the first intimation of what would soon follow. I declined to make any such statement, which I found demeaning; what right had any organization to demand anyone's pledge of loyalty? I was sure the whole thing would soon go away; it was just too outrageous.

But instead of the problem disappearing, the studio actually made another film, a short to be shown with Salesman. This was called The Life of a Salesman and consisted of several lectures by City College School of Business professors - which boiled down to selling was a joy, one of the most gratifying and useful professions, and that Willy was simply a nut. Never in show-business history has a studio spent so
much good money to prove that its feature film was pointless. In less than two years Death of a Salesman had gone from being a masterpiece to being a heresy, and a fraudulent one at that.

In 1948-51, I had the sensation of being trapped inside a perverse work of art, one of those Escher constructs in which it is impossible to make out whether a stairway is going up or down. Practically everyone I knew stood within the conventions of the political left of center; one or two were Communist party members, some were fellow-travelers, and most had had a brush with Marxist ideas or organizations. I have never been able to believe in the reality of these people being actual or putative traitors any more than I could be, yet others like them were being fired from teaching or jobs in government or large corporations. The surrealism of it all never left me. We were living in an art form, a metaphor that had suddenly, incredibly, gripped the country.

In today’s terms, the country had been delivered into the hands of the radical right, a ministry of free-floating apprehension toward anything that never happens in the middle of Missouri. It is always with us, this anxiety, sometimes directed towards foreigners, Jews, Catholics, fluoridated water, aliens in space, masturbation, homosexuality, or the Internal Revenue Department. But in the 50s any of these could be validated as real threats by rolling out a map of China. And if this seems crazy now, it seemed just as crazy then, but openly doubting it could cost you.

So in one sense The Crucible was an attempt to make life real again, palpable and structured. One hoped that a work of art might illuminate the tragic absurdities of an anterior work of art that was called reality, but was not. It was the very swiftness of the change that lent it this surreality. Only three or four years earlier an American movie audience, on seeing a newsreel of Stalin saluting the Red Army, would have applauded, for that army had taken the brunt of the Nazi onslaught, as most people were aware. Now they would look on with fear or at least bewilderment, for the Russians had become the enemy of mankind, a menace to all that was good. It was the Germans who, with amazing rapidity, were turning good. Could this be real?

In the unions, communists and their allies, known as intrepid organizers, were to be shorn of membership and turned out as seditious. Harry Bridges, the idol of west coast longshoremen, whom he had all but single-handedly organized, was subjected to trial after trial to drive him back to his native Australia as an unadmitted communist. Academics, some prominent in their fields, were especially targeted, many forced to retire or fired for disloyalty. Some were communists, some were fellow travelers and, inevitably, a certain number were unaffiliated liberals refusing to sign one of the dozens of humiliating anti-communist pledges being required by terrified college administrations.

But it is impossible to convey properly the fears that marked that period. Nobody was shot, to be sure, although some were going to jail, where at least one, William Remington, was murdered by an inmate hoping to shorten his sentence by having killed a communist. Rather than physical fear, it was the sense of impotence, which seemed to deepen with each week, of being unable to speak accurately of the very recent past when being leftwing in America, and for that matter in Europe, was to be alive to the dilemmas of the day.
As for the idea of willingly subjecting my work not only to some party's discipline but to anyone's control, my repugnance was such that, as a young and indigent writer, I had turned down lucrative offers to work for Hollywood studios because of a revulsion at the thought of someone owning the paper I was typing on. It was not long, perhaps four or five years, before the fraudulence of Soviet cultural claims was as clear to me as it should have been earlier. But I would never have found it believable, in the 50s or later, that with its thuggish self-righteousness and callous contempt for artists' freedoms, that the Soviet way of controlling culture could be successfully exported to America.

Some greatly talented people were driven out of the US to work in England: screenwriters like Carl Foreman and Donald Ogden Stewart, actors like Charlie Chaplin and Sam Wanamaker. I no longer recall the number of our political exiles, but it was more than too many and disgraceful for a nation proud of its democracy.

Writing now, almost half a century later, with the Soviet Union in ruins, China rhetorically fending off capitalism even as in reality it adopts a market economy, Cuba wallowing helplessly in the Caribbean, it is not easy to convey the American fear of a masterful communism. The quickness with which Soviet-style regimes had taken over eastern Europe and China was breathtaking, and I believe it stirred up a fear in Americans of our own ineptitudes, our mystifying inability, despite our military victories, to control the world whose liberties we had so recently won back from the Axis powers.

In 1956, the House Un-American Activities Committee (Huac) subpoenaed me - I was cited for contempt of Congress for refusing to identify writers I had met at one of the two communist writers' meetings I had attended many years before. By then, the tide was going out for Huac and it was finding it more difficult to make front pages. However, the news of my forthcoming marriage to Marilyn Monroe was too tempting to be passed. That our marriage had some connection with my being subpoenaed was confirmed when Chairman Walters of the Huac sent word to Joseph Rauh, my lawyer, that he would be inclined to cancel my hearing if Miss Monroe would consent to have a picture taken with him.

The offer having been declined, the good chairman, as my hearing came to an end, entreated me to write less tragically about our country. This lecture cost me $40,000 in lawyer's fees, a year's suspended sentence for contempt of Congress, and a $500 fine. Not to mention about a year of inanition in my creative life.

My fictional view of the period, my sense of its unreality had been, like any impotence, a psychologically painful experience. A similar paralysis descended on Salem. In both places, to keep social unity intact, the authority of leaders had to be hardened and words of skepticism toward them constricted. A new cautionary diction, an uncustomary prudence inflected our way of talking to one another. The word socialism was all but taboo. Words had gotten fearsome. As I learned directly in Ann Arbor on a 1953 visit, university students were avoiding renting rooms in houses run by the housing cooperative for fear of being labeled communist, so darkly suggestive was the word cooperative. The head of orientation at the university told me, in a rather cool, uninvolved manner, that the FBI was enlisting professors to report on students voicing leftwing opinions, and - more comedy - that they had also engaged students to report on professors with the same views.
In the early 50s, along with Elia Kazan, who had directed All My Sons and Death of a Salesman, I submitted a script to Harry Cohn, head of Columbia Pictures. It described the murderous corruption in the gangster-ridden Brooklyn longshoremen’s union. Cohn read the script and called us to Hollywood, where he casually informed us that he had had the script vetted by the FBI, and that they had seen nothing subversive in it. But the head of the AFL motion picture unions in Hollywood, Roy Brewer, had condemned it as untrue communist propaganda, since there were no gangsters on the Brooklyn waterfront. Cohn, no stranger to gangsterism, having survived an upbringing in the tough Five Points area of Manhattan, opined that Brewer was only trying to protect Joe Ryan, head of the Brooklyn longshoremen (who, incidentally, would go to Sing Sing prison for gangsterism).

Brewer threatened to call a strike of projectionists in any theatre daring to show the film. Cohn offered his solution to the problem: he would produce the film if I would make one change - the gangsters in the union were to be changed to communists. This would not be easy; I knew all the communists on the waterfront - there were two of them (both of whom in the following decade became millionnaire businessmen). So I had to withdraw the script, which prompted an indignant telegram from Cohn: "As soon as we try to make the script pro-American you pull out." One understood not only the threat but also the cynicism: he knew the mafia controlled waterfront labor. Had I been a movie writer, my career would have ended. But the theatre had no such complications, no blacklist - not yet - and I longed to respond to this climate of fear, if only to protect my sanity. But where to find a transcendent concept?

The heart of the darkness was the belief that a massive, profoundly organized conspiracy was in place and carried forward mainly by a concealed phalanx of intellectuals, including labor activists, teachers, professionals, sworn to undermine the American government. And it was precisely the invisibility of ideas that was frightening so many people. How could a play deal with this mirage world?

Paranoia breeds paranoia, but below paranoia there lies a bristling, unwelcome truth, so repugnant as to produce fantasies of persecution to conceal its existence. The unwelcome truth denied by the right was that the Hollywood writers accused of subversion were not a menace to the country, or even bearers of meaningful change. They wrote not propaganda but entertainment, some of it of a mildly liberal cast, but most of it mindless, or when it was political, as with Preston Sturges or Frank Capra, entirely and exuberantly un-Marxist.

As for the left, its unacknowledged truth was more important for me. If nobody was being shot in our ideological war but merely vivisected by a headline, it struck me as odd, if understandable, that the accused were unable to cry out passionately their faith in the ideals of socialism. There were attacks on the Huac’s right to demand that a citizen reveal his political beliefs; but on the idealistic canon of their own convictions, the defendants were mute. The rare exception, like Paul Robeson’s declaration of faith in socialism as a cure for racism, was a rocket that lit up the sky.

On a lucky afternoon I happened upon The Devil in Massachusetts, by Marion Starkey, a narrative of the Salem witch-hunt of 1692. I knew this story from my college reading, but in this darkened America it turned a completely new aspect toward me: the poetry of the hunt. Poetry may seem an odd word for a
witch-hunt but I saw there was something of the marvelous in the spectacle of a whole village, if not an entire province, whose imagination was captured by a vision of something that wasn’t there.

In time to come, the notion of equating the red-hunt with the witch-hunt would be condemned as a deception. There were communists and there never were witches. The deeper I moved into the 1690s, the further away drifted the America of the 50s, and, rather than the appeal of analogy, I found something different to draw my curiosity and excitement.

Anyone standing up in the Salem of 1692 and denying that witches existed would have faced immediate arrest, the hardest interrogation and possibly the rope. Every authority not only confirmed the existence of witches but never questioned the necessity of executing them. It became obvious that to dismiss witchcraft was to forgo any understanding of how it came to pass that tens of thousands had been murdered as witches in Europe. To dismiss any relation between that episode and the hunt for subversives was to shut down an insight into not only the similar emotions but also the identical practices of both officials and victims.

There were witches, if not to most of us then certainly to everyone in Salem; and there were communists, but what was the content of their menace? That to me became the issue. Having been deeply influenced as a student by a Marxist approach to society, and having known Marxists and sympathizers, I could simply not accept that these people were spies or even prepared to do the will of the Soviets in some future crisis. That such people had thought to find hope of a higher ethic in the Soviet was not simply an American, but a worldwide, irony of catastrophic moral proportions, for their like could be found all over the world.

But as the 50s dawned, they were stuck with the past. Part of the surrealism of the anti-left sweep was that it picked up people for disgrace who had already turned away from a pro-Soviet past but had no stomach for naming others who had merely shared their illusions. But the hunt had captured some significant part of the American imagination and its power demanded respect.

Turning to Salem was like looking into a petri dish, an embalmed stasis with its principal moving forces caught in stillness. One had to wonder what the human imagination fed on that could inspire neighbors and old friends to emerge overnight as furies secretly bent on the torture and destruction of Christians. More than a political metaphor, more than a moral tale, The Crucible, as it developed over more than a year, became the awesome evidence of the power of human imagination inflamed, the poetry of suggestion, and the tragedy of heroic resistance to a society possessed to the point of ruin.

In the stillness of the Salem courthouse, surrounded by the images of the 1950s but with my head in 1692, what the two eras had in common gradually gained definition. Both had the menace of concealed plots, but most startling were the similarities in the rituals of defense, the investigative routines; 300 years apart, both prosecutions alleged membership of a secret, disloyal group. Should the accused confess, his honesty could only be proved by naming former confederates. The informer became the axe of the plot’s existence and the investigation’s necessity.
The witch-hunt in 1692 had a not dissimilar problem, but a far more poetic solution. Most suspected people named by others as members of the Devil's conspiracy had not been shown to have done anything, neither poisoning wells, setting barns on fire, sickening cattle, aborting babies, nor undermining the virtue of wives (the Devil having two phenomenally active penises, one above the other).

To the rescue came a piece of poetry, smacking of both legalistic and religious validity, called Spectral Evidence. All the prosecution need do was produce a witness who claimed to have seen, not an accused person, but his familiar spirit - his living ghost - in the act of throwing a burning brand into a barn full of hay. You could be at home asleep in your bed, but your spirit could be crawling through your neighbor's window to feel up his wife. The owner of the wandering spirit was obliged to account to the court for his crime. With Spectral Evidence, the air filled with the malign spirits of those identified by good Christians as confederates of the Beast, and the Devil himself danced happily into Salem village and took the place apart.

I spent 10 days in Salem courthouse reading the crudely recorded trials of the 1692 outbreak, and it was striking how totally absent was any sense of irony, let alone humor. I can't recall if it was the provincial governor's nephew or son who, with a college friend, came from Boston to watch the strange proceedings. Both boys burst out laughing at some absurd testimony: they were promptly jailed, and faced possible hanging.

Irony and humor were not conspicuous in the 1950s either. I was in my lawyer's office to sign some contract and a lawyer in the next office was asked to come in and notarize my signature. While he was stamping pages, I continued a discussion with my lawyer about the Broadway theatre, which I said was corrupt; the art of theatre had been totally displaced by the bottom line, all that mattered any more. Looking up at me, the notarizing lawyer said, "That's a communist position, you know." I started to laugh until I saw the constraint in my lawyer's face, and I quickly sobered up.

I am glad that I managed to write *The Crucible*, but looking back I have often wished I'd had the temperament to do an absurd comedy, which is what the situation deserved. Now, after more than three-quarters of a century of fascination with the great snake of political and social developments, I can see more than a few occasions when we were confronted by the same sensation of having stepped into another age.

A young film producer asked me to write a script about what was then called juvenile delinquency. A mystifying, unprecedented outbreak of gang violence had exploded all over New York. The city, in return for a good percentage of profits, had contracted with this producer to open police stations and schools to his camera. I spent the summer of 1955 in Brooklyn streets with two gangs and wrote an outline. I was ready to proceed with the script when an attack on me as a disloyal lefthy opened in the New York World Telegram. The cry went up that the city must cancel its contract with the producer so long as I was the screenwriter. A hearing was arranged, attended by 22 city commissioners, including the police, fire, welfare and sanitation departments, as well as two judges.
At the conference table there also sat a lady who produced a thick folder of petitions and statements I had signed, going back to my college years, provided to her by the Huac. I defended myself; I thought I was making sense when the lady began screaming that I was killing the boys in Korea [this was during the Korean war]. She meant me personally, as I could tell from the froth at the corners of her mouth, the fury in her eyes, and her finger pointing straight into my face.

The vote was taken and came up one short of continuing the city's collaboration, and the film was killed that afternoon. I always wondered whether the crucial vote against me came from the sanitation department. But it was not a total loss; the suffocating sensation of helplessness before the spectacle of the impossible coming to pass would soon help in writing The Crucible.

That impossible coming to pass was not an observation made at a comfortable distance but a blade cutting directly into my life. This was especially the case with Elia Kazan's decision to cooperate with the Huac. The surrounding fears felt even by those with the most fleeting of contacts with any communist-supported organization were enough to break through long associations and friendships.

Kazan had been a member of the Communist party only a matter of months, and even that link had ended years before. And the party had never been illegal, nor was membership in it. Yet this great director, left undefended by 20th Century Fox executives, his longtime employers, was told that if he refused to name people whom he had known in the party - actors, directors and writers - he would never be allowed to direct another picture in Hollywood, meaning the end of his career.

These names were already known to the committee through other testifiers and FBI informants, but exactly as in Salem - or Russia under the Czar and the Chairman, and Inquisition Spain, Revolutionary France or any other place of revolution or counter-revolution - conspiracy was the name for all opposition. And the reformation of the accused could only be believed when he gave up the names of his co-conspirators. Only this ritual of humiliation, the breaking of pride and independence, could win the accused readmission into the community. The process inevitably did produce in the accused a new set of political, social and even moral convictions more acceptable to the state whose fist had been shoved into his face, with his utter ruin promised should he resist.

I had stopped by Kazan's house in the country in 1952 after he had called me to come and talk, an unusual invitation - he had never been inclined to indulge in talk unless it concerned work. I had suspected from his dark tone that it must have to do with the Huac, which was rampaging through the Hollywood ranks.

Since I was on my way up to Salem for research on a play that I was still unsure I would write, I called at his house, which was on my route. As he laid out his dilemma and his decision to comply with the Huac (which he had already done) it was impossible not to feel his anguish, old friends that we were. But the crunch came when I felt fear, that great teacher, that cruel revealer. For it swept over me that, had I been one of his comrades, he would have spent my name as part of the guarantee of his reform. Even so, oddly enough, I was not filling up with hatred or contempt for him; his suffering was too palpable. The whole hateful procedure had brought him to this, and I believe made the writing of The Crucible all but inevitable. Even if one could grant Kazan sincerity in his new-found anti-communism, the concept of
an America where such self-discoveries were pressed out of people was outrageous, and a contradiction of any concept of personal liberty.

Is all this of some objective importance in our history, this destruction of bonds between people? I think it may be, however personal it may appear. Kazan's testimony created a far greater shock than anyone else's. Lee J Cobb's similar testimony and Jerome Robbins's cooperation seemed hardly to matter. It may be that Kazan had been loved more than any other, that he had attracted far greater affection from writers and actors with whom he had worked, and so what was overtly a political act was sensed as a betrayal of love.

It is very significant that in the uproar set off by last year's award to Kazan of an Oscar for life achievement, one heard no mention of the name of any member of the Huac. One doubted whether the thought occurred to many people that the studio heads had ignominiously collapsed before the Huac's insistence that they institute a blacklist of artists, something they had once insisted was dishonorable and a violation of democratic norms. Half a century had passed since his testimony, but Kazan bore very nearly the whole onus of the era, as though he had manufactured its horrors - when he was surely its victim. The trial record in Salem courthouse had been written by ministers in a primitive shorthand. This condensation gave emphasis to a gnarled, densely packed language which suggested the country accents of a hard people. To lose oneself day after day in that record of human delusion was to know a fear, not for one's safety, but of the spectacle of intelligent people giving themselves over to a rapture of murderous credulity. It was as though the absence of real evidence was itself a release from the burdens of this world; in love with the invisible, they moved behind their priests, closer to that mystical communion which is anarchy and is called God.

Evidence, in contrast, is effort; leaping to conclusions is a wonderful pleasure, and for a while there was a highly charged joy in Salem, for now that they could see through everything to the frightful plot that was daily being laid bare in court sessions, their days, formerly so eventless and long, were swallowed up in hourly revelations, news, surprises. The Crucible is less a polemic than it might have been had it not been filled with wonder at the protean imagination of man.

The Crucible straddles two different worlds to make them one, but it is not history in the usual sense of the word, but a moral, political and psychological construct that floats on the fluid emotions of both eras. As a commercial entertainment the play failed [it opened in 1953]. To start with there was the title: nobody knew what a crucible was. Most of the critics, as sometimes does happen, never caught on to the play's ironical substructure, and the ones who did were nervous about validating a work that was so unkind to the same sanctified procedural principles as underlay the hunt for reds. Some old acquaintances gave me distant nods in the theatre lobby on opening night, and even without air-conditioning the house was cool. There was also a problem with the temperature of the production.

The director, Jed Harris, a great name in the theatre of the 20s, 30s and 40s, had decided that the play, which he believed a classic, should be staged like a Dutch painting. In Dutch paintings of groups, everyone is always looking front. Unfortunately, on a stage such rigidity can only lead an audience to the exits. Several years after, a gang of young actors, setting up chairs in the ballroom of the McAlpin Hotel,
fired up the audience, convinced the critics, and the play at last took off and soon found its place. There were cheering reviews but by then Senator McCarthy was dead. The public fever on whose heat waves he had spread his wings had subsided.

*The Crucible* is my most-produced play. It seems to be one of the few surviving shards of the so-called McCarthy period. And it is part of the play's history that, to people in so many parts of the world, its story seems to be their own. I used to think, half seriously, that you could tell when a dictator was about to take power, or had been overthrown, in a Latin American country, if *The Crucible* was suddenly being produced in that country.

The result of it all is that I have come, rather reluctantly, to respect delusion, not least of all my own. There are no passions quite as hot and pleasurable as those of the deluded. Compared to the bliss of delusion, its vivid colors, blazing lights, explosions, whistles and liberating joys, the search for evidence is a deadly bore. My heart was with the left, if only because the right hated me enough to want to kill me, as the Germans amply proved. And now, the most blatant and most foul anti-Semitism is in Russia, leaving people like me filled not so much with surprise as a kind of wonder at the incredible amount of hope there once was, and how it disappeared and whether in time it will ever come again, attached, no doubt, to some new illusion.

There is hardly a week that passes when I don't ask the unanswerable question: what am I now convinced of that will turn out to be ridiculous? And yet one can't forever stand on the shore; at some point, filled with indecision, skepticism, reservation and doubt, you either jump in or concede that life is forever elsewhere. Which, I dare say, was one of the major impulses behind the decision to attempt *The Crucible*.

Salem village, that pious, devout settlement at the edge of white civilization, had displayed - three centuries before the Russo-American rivalry and the issues it raised - what can only be called a built-in pestilence in the human mind; a fatality forever awaiting the right conditions for its always unique, forever unprecedented outbreak of distrust, alarm, suspicion and murder. And for people wherever the play is performed on any of the five continents, there is always a certain amazement that the same terror that is happening to them or that is threatening them, has happened before to others. It is all very strange. But then, the Devil is known to lure people into forgetting what it is vital for them to remember - how else could his endless reappearances always come as such a marvelous surprise?
"It's okay – We're hunting Communists"

The Cold War revived the anti-communist hysteria that had gripped the United States after World War I. In 1947 Congress revived the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC), opposed by Herb Block since its inception in the 1930s and declared by President Truman to be itself the most un-American activity. Herb Block comments: "The FBI, under J. Edgar Hoover, helped provide the committee with material from its aptly named 'raw files'. Some producers, directors and screen writers refused to testify or to play the 'name game' in which the committee demanded the names of associates, who could then be called on to name others thus providing an ever-expanding list of suspects to be summoned."


"You read books, eh?"

During the postwar anti-communist campaign hundreds of elementary and high school teachers were investigated and lost their jobs, sometimes as a result of being named by proliferating "anti-subversive" groups and individuals. Some individuals compiled and circulated their own blacklists, which were accepted by frightened employers and casting directors who feared being blacklisted themselves if they sought facts and fair play. The motives of some self-serving or vindictive accusers were summed up by Herb Block in a phrase: "If you can't crush the commies, you can nail a neighbor."

Political Cartoon Analysis on McCarthyism

"We now have new and important evidence"

Senator Joseph McCarthy's continued string of reckless charges of communism in government created such a sensation that the Senate appointed a special committee under Millard E. Tydings to investigate his "evidence." McCarthy managed to turn the hearings into a circus, each new charge obscuring the fact that earlier accusations weren't backed up. Despite a final report by the committee discrediting McCarthy's tactics and evidence, he emerged with more general support than ever. And "anti-subversive" hearings by other committees of Congress, particularly the Senate Internal Security Committee headed by Senator Pat McCarran (D-Nevada), continued treating rumors and unsupported charges as "evidence."

"We now have new and important evidence," May 8, 1950. Ink, graphite, and opaque white over graphite underdrawing on layered paper. Published in the Washington Post (28). LC-USZ62-126908

"I have here in my hand . . . ."

In 1954, Senator Joseph McCarthy went too far when he took on the United States Army, accusing it of promoting communists. The Senate held special hearings, known as the Army-McCarthy hearings, which were among the first to be televised nationally. In the course of testimony McCarthy submitted evidence that was identified as fraudulent. As both public and politicians watched the bullying antics of the Senator, they became increasingly disenchanted. Before the year was out McCarthy, whose charges had first hit the headlines in February 1950, was censured by his colleagues for "conduct unbecoming a senator."

THE MAN OF IRON: GILES COREY

I will not plead
If I deny, I am condemned already,
In courts where ghosts appear as witnesses
And swear men's lives away. If I confess,
Then I confess a lie, to buy a life,
Which is not life, but only death in life.
--William Wadsworth Longfellow

Giles Corey was a prosperous, uneducated, eighty-year-old farmer and full member of the church. He and his wife Martha lived on a farm in the southwest corner of Salem village.

In March of 1692, Martha Corey made the mistake of publicly questioning the sincerity of the accusations of the afflicted girls. When the girls learned of her attacks, they quickly responded by accusing her of witchcraft. During an examination before John Hathorne, the girls claimed to see a yellow bird sucking between Martha Corey's fingers. They interrupted Hathorne's questioning with piercing screams and claims that Corey was biting, scratching, or strangling them. Ann Putnam told Hathorne that she had one night seen Corey praying to the Devil outside the window of the Putnam home during a family dinner. Based on the girls' testimony, Martha Corey was sent to the Salem jail to await trial.

Giles Corey, certain of his Martha's innocence, spoke out against the girls who sent his wife to jail. Unsurprisingly, the girls countered with accusations of witchcraft against Giles in April 1692. Ann Putnam claimed that on April 13 the specter of Giles Corey visited her and asked her to write in the Devil's book. Later, Putnam was to claim that a ghost appeared before her to announce that it had been murdered by Corey. Other girls were to describe Corey as "a dreadful wizard" and recount stories of assaults by his specter.

Corey was examined by magistrates on April 18, then left to languish with his wife in prison for five months awaiting trial. When Corey's case finally went before the grand jury in September, nearly a dozen witnesses came forward with damning evidence such as testimony by Elizabeth and Alice Booth that Corey served bread and wine at a sacrament attended by over fifty witches. Both Ann Putnam and Mercy Lewis described Corey as "a dreadful wizard." Corey knew he faced conviction and execution, so he chose to refuse to stand for trial. By avoiding conviction, it became more likely that his farm, which Corey recently deeded to his two sons-in-law, would not become property of the state upon his death.

The penalty for refusing to stand for trial was death by pressing under heavy stones. It was a punishment never before seen—or ever again inflicted—in the colony of Massachusetts. On Monday, September 19, Corey was stripped naked, a board placed upon his chest, and then—while his neighbors watched—heavy stones and rocks were piled on the board. Corey pleaded to have more weight added, so that his death might come quickly.

Samuel Sewall reported Corey's death: "About noon, at Salem, Giles Corey was press'd to death for standing mute." Robert Calef, in his report of the event, added a gruesome detail: Giles's "tongue being prest out of his mouth, the Sheriff with his cane forced it in again, when he was dying." Judge Jonathan Corwin ordered Corey buried in an unmarked grave on Gallows Hill.

Corey is often seen as a martyr who "gave back fortitude and courage rather than spite and bewilderment." His very public death played a role in building public opposition to the witchcraft trials.

http://lax2.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/fttrials/salem/gilescoreypage.HTM
EXAMINATION OF TITUBA

Tituba the Ind’n Women’s Exam [March 1, 1692]

http://law2.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/ftrials/salem/ASA_TITX.HTM

Why do you hurt these poor Children? What harm have they done unto you?
Tituba: They do no harm to me. I no hurt them at all.

Why have you done it?
T: I have done nothing; I can’t tell when the Devil works.

What does the Devil tell you that he hurts them?
T: No, he tells me nothing.

Do you never see Something appear in Some shape?
T: No, never See anything.

What familiarity have you with the devil, or what is it if you Converse with all? Tell the truth who it is that hurts them.
T: The Devil for ought I know.

What appearance or how dothe he appear when the hurts them, with what shape or what is he like that hurts them?
T: Like a man I think yesterday I being in the Lentoe Chamber I saw a thing like a man, that told me Serve him & I told him no I would not do Such thing. [Recorder’s note: she charges Goody Osborne & Sarah Good as those that hurt the Children, and would have had here done it, she sayth she Seen four of which she knew not she saw them last night as she was washing the Room] they told me hurt the Children & would have had me if I would not go & hurt them they would do so to me at first I did agree with them butt afterward I told them I do so no more.

Would they have had you hurt the Children the Last Night?
T: Yes, but I was Sorry & I said, I would do So no more, but told I would fear God.

But why did not you do So before?
T: Why they tell me I had done So before & therefore I must go on, these were the four women & the man [Recorder’s note: but she knew none but Osburne & Good only, the others were of Boston]

At first beginning with them, what then appeared to you what was it like that got you to do it?
T: One like a man Just as I was going to sleep Came to me this was when the Children was first hurt he said he would kill the Children & she would never be well, and he Said if I would not Serve him he would do so to me.

Is that the Same man that appeared before to you that appeared the last night & told you this?
T: Yes

What Other likenesses besides a man hath appeared to you?
T: Sometimes like a hog Sometimes like a great black dog, four times.

But what did they Say unto you?
T: They told me Serve him & that was a good way; that was the black dog I told him I was afraid, he told me he would be worse than to me.

What did you say to him after that?
T: I answered I will Serve you no Longer he told me he would do me hurt then.

What other Creatures have you seen?
T: A bird.
What bird?
T: A little yellow bird.

Where does it keep?
T: With the man who hath pretty things there besides.

What other pretty things?
T: He hath not showed them [yet] unto me, but he said he would show them me tomorrow, and he told me if I would serve him I should have the Bird.

What other Creatures did you see?
T: I saw two Cats, one Red, another black as big as a little dog.

What did these Cats do?
T: I don’t know; I have seen them two times.

What did they say?
T: They say serve him.

When did you see them?
T: I saw them last night.

Did they do any hurt to you or threaten you?
T: They did scratch me

When?
T: After prayer; and scratched me; because I would not serve them and when they went away I could not see but they stood before the fire.

What Service do they Expect from you?
T: They Say more hurt to the Children.

How did you pinch them when you hurt them?
T: The other pull me & hail me to the pinch the Child, & I am very sorry for it.

What made you hold your arm when you were Searched? What had you there?
T: I had nothing.

Do not those Cats suck you?
T: No never yet. I would not let them but they had almost thrust me into the fire.

How do you hurt those that you pinch? Do you get those Cats? Or other things to do it for you? Tell us, how is it done?
T: The man sends the Cats to me & bids me pinch them, & I think I went over to Mr. Grigg’s & have pinched her this day in the morning the man brought Mr. Grigg’s maid to me & made me pinch her.

Did you ever go with these women?
T: They are very strong & pull me & make me go with them.

Where did you go?
T: Up to Mr. Putnam’s & make me go with them & make me hurt the Child.

Who did make you go?
T: Man that is very strong & these two women, Good & Osborne but I am Sorry.
How did you go? What do you Ride upon?
T: I Ride upon a stick or pole & Good & Osburne behind me we Ride taking hold of one another don't know how we go for I Saw no trees nor path, but was presently there when we were up.

How long Since you began to pinch Mr. Parris's Children?
T: I did not pinch them at the first, but he make me afterward

Have you Seen Good and Osborne Ride upon a pole?
T: Yes & have held fast by me: I was not at Mr. Grigg's but once, but it may be Send Something like me, with or would I have gone, but that they tell me, they will hurt me; last night they Tell me I must kill Somebody with the knife.

Who were they that told you So?
T: Sarah Good & Osburne & they would have had me killed Thomas Putnam's Child last night. the Child also affirmed that at the Same time they would have had her Cut of her own head for if she would not then told her Tituba would Cut it off & then she Complained at the Same time of a knife Cutting of her when her master hath asked her about these things she sayth they will not let her tell, butt Tell her if she Tells her head shall be Cut off

Who Tells you So?
T: The man, Good & Osborne's Wife. Goody Good Came to her last night when her master was at prayer & would not let her hear & she Could not hear a good while. Good hath one of these birds the yellow bird & would have given me it, but I would not have it & prayer time she stopped my ears & would not let me hear.

What should you have done with it?
T: Give it to the Children which yellow bird hath bin several times Seen by the Children I saw Sarah Good have it on her hand when she Came to the fore finger & long finger upon the Right hand.

Did you never practice witch-craft in your own Country?
T: No. Never before now.

Did you See them do it now?
T: Yes. Today, but that was in the morning.

But did you see them do it now while you are Examining?
T: No, I did not See them but I saw them hurt at other times. I saw Good have a Cat beside the yellow bird which was with her.

What hath Osburne got to go with her?
T: Something I don't know what it is. I can't name it, I don't know how it looks she hath tow of them one of them hath wings & two Legs & a had like a women the Children Saw the Same but yesterday which afterward turned into a women.

What is the other thing that Good Osburne hath?
T: Aching all over hairy, all the face hairy & a long nose & I don't know what it is. I can't name it, I don't know how it looks she hath two of them one of them hat wings & two Legs, it goeth upright & is about two or three foot high & goeth upright like a man & last night it stood before the fire in Mr. Paris's hall.

What Clothes doth the man appear unto you in?
T: Black Clothes Some times, Sometimes Serge Coat of other Color, a Tall man with white hair, I think.
“What is Communism?”

By Natalya King

Thursday 17th June 2010

To many people, communism is an evil force that kills people and doesn’t allow them to vote or speak freely. That’s partly true in terms of how Eastern Europe and China was run during the Cold War of the 20th Century. However, the underlying goals behind communism are somewhat less brutal. Communism is a system of government and ideals where all people are considered equal in an attempt to create a fairer society. It was formed as an alternative to the strict capitalist system in 19th century Europe where the class structure was seeing the rich getting richer and the poor getting poorer.

The idea of communism

In a communist country, all property – land, businesses and resources – is owned by the people through the government. The income from that wealth is then distributed evenly to ensure everyone is healthy, educated and financially secure. Inheritance and owning a business for private gain for example is forbidden. Although communism as an idea had been around for ages, German philosophers Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels are generally credited with ‘inventing’ it. Their 1848 book, The Communist Manifesto, set out its core principles. It stated that the working class would lead a revolution against the ruling class, making way for a leader to take control of the government and redistribute wealth. A kind of utopia would be achieved once all non-communists had been converted and everyone belonged to the same social class. But it didn’t quite work out that way.

Putting communism into practice

In 1917, the Russian Vladimir Lenin put Marx and Engels’ ideas into practice by leading the Bolshevik revolution in overthrowing Russia’s government. However, communism was a hard sell, and as Chairman of the new communist government (the Soviet Union), Lenin made some brutal decisions such as starving the poor to gain their support, and killing anyone who disagreed with him. And with communists believing that communism should be international, the Russians then attempted to spread their thinking across the world during the Cold War. By the time the Cold War ended (and with it, communism in Russia), communism had spread to countries such as Bulgaria, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Romania, Cuba, North Korea, China, Ethiopia and Somalia. Today, only Cuba, North Korea and to a lesser extent Vietnam, Laos and China are communist countries.

Day to day life

In a true communist country, the government has complete control over the economy. Hospitals, schools, prisons, shops, farms, factories, transport and universities are all provided by the government. In communist China under Mao Zedong (from 1949-1976), every worker was employed by the government, and the government allocated housing, issued travel permits and marriage licenses, and granted permission for people to enter university or change jobs. Traditional communist restrictions extend to ideas too. For example, there are no copyright laws, meaning all media and ideas are available to everyone, and the media is controlled by the government. And even in places where elections are held, the people can only vote for political leaders from a list of organizations approved by the current government.

Modern communist countries

Of the modern communist countries, Cuba and North Korea are the most hard lines. Their economies are centrally planned, which means the government sets prices and decides on quantities for production and consumption. In Cuba’s case, about 80% of businesses are owned by the government and 20% by the private sector. The less hard line countries of China, Vietnam and Laos have all moved towards a market economy (i.e. private business ownership where prices and production are set by business competition). However, their governments still own considerably more businesses, including some of the largest banks, oil and insurance companies, and spend far more on social welfare than capitalist countries. In reality, China, Laos and Vietnam are run by communist political parties, but practice what Marx called the halfway point between communism and capitalism – socialism. They remain committed to the ideas behind communism, such as spreading enough wealth to look after society’s poor, but also allow a certain amount of business freedom, ownership and trade.

Criticisms

The main problem with communism is that leaders have never truly been able to deliver on the key promise: that the government could meet the basic needs of citizens through total control of the economy. In reality, people’s motivations
are stifled by a lack of profit and intellectual property rights, meaning new ideas and technology are a lot slower to develop. Furthermore, communism’s success relies on taking wealth away from the rich and powerful, a concept that is difficult, unpopular and relies on violence for success. And in practice, communism has allowed a dictator or group of dictators to suppress a country’s citizens, only to become wealthy themselves through greed and corruption. Marx and Engels hoped that communism would mean the end of poverty, but today, only Cuba and North Korea are still game enough to try. 

http://www.thecornellreview.com/dead平生笑傲雄
Crucible

A crucible is a cup-shaped piece of laboratory equipment used to contain chemical compounds when heating them to very high temperatures. The receptacle is usually made of porcelain or an inert metal. One of the earliest uses of platinum was to make crucibles. More recently, metals such as nickel and zirconium have been used.

A crucible is also a container in which metals are molten, usually for temperatures above 500°C. These crucibles are usually made of graphite with clay as a binder. These crucibles are very durable and resist temperatures to over 1600°C. A crucible is placed into a furnace and, after the melting, the liquid metal is taken out of the furnace and poured into the mold. Some furnaces (usually electric or induction) have an embedded crucible and are tilted when the metal is poured out.

The term crucible is often used for unrelated activities that are very difficult, but act as a refining or hardening process.

Definition from Chemistry Daily, The Chemistry Encyclopedia
http://www.chemistrydaily.com/chemistry/Crucible

Excerpt from the introduction to the play:

“The Salem tragedy, which is about to begin in these pages, developed from a paradox. It is a paradox in whose grip we still live, and there is no prospect that we will discover its resolution. Simply, it was this: for good purposes, even high purposes, the people of Salem developed a theocracy, a combine of state and religious power whose function was to keep the community together, and to prevent any kind of disunity that might open it to destruction by material or ideological enemies. It was forged for a necessary purpose and accomplished that purpose. But all organization must be grounded on the idea of exclusion and prohibition, just as two objects cannot occupy the same space.” (Arthur Miller The Crucible, p. 16)

Based upon these texts, why did Arthur Miller use *The Crucible* as the title for his play?
During the winter of 1652 eight girls came down with a mysterious and terrifying illness in the colonial town of Salem, Massachusetts. They vomited, screamed incomprehensibly, claimed to see things that weren’t there, felt the crawling and pricking of invisible needles against their skin, and convulsed and contorted into impossible positions. Physicians were called to examine the girls, but they couldn’t find any medical cause for the alarming symptoms. Neighbors began to suspect that the girls were bewitched. As unease spread the girls began to accuse other townspeople of witchcraft, identifying them as their tormenters. What followed were the Salem Witch Trials and a period of paranoia and violence. When the trials abruptly ended several months later twenty men and women had been executed for the crime of witchcraft. The Witch Trials have become engrained in the American psyche as a near-mythical cautionary tale about the dangers of panic and hasty reaction. But what really happened in Salem nearly 400 years ago? Were the eight girls who sparked the Witch Trials faking illness? Their symptoms sound pretty outlandish so it’s easy to dismiss them as made-up. But given the severity of the symptoms and the gravity of the resulting situation it seems unlikely that all eight girls were lying. Another possibility is that the girls may have actually been sick. Just because the 17th century physicians in Salem couldn’t identify a medical cause for the illness doesn’t mean one didn’t exist (if I were sick I probably wouldn’t trust a 17th century physician). First proposed by Linda Caporael in 1976, one of the most interesting explanations for the described symptoms involves unintentional ergot poisoning, or ergotism.

Ergot is a fungus that grows on grain, especially rye. It was commonly found in European and American rye through the 19th century. Ergot is interesting because it is a particularly prolific fungus—it produces an impressive variety of neurotoxins and hallucinogens that remain in bread products made from infected grain even after the grain has been processed. The psychedelic hallucinogen LSD was first made using an extract that was isolated from ergot. But when eaten, the cocktail of poisonous neurotoxins and hallucinogens found in ergot-infected grain makes for a pretty bad trip—ergot poisoning leads to convulsive fits, vomiting, pricking sensations under the skin, and hallucinations. These symptoms sound suspiciously similar to the illness experienced by the Salem girls. And in fact, other townspeople testified under oath that they had seen apparitions and lights that others who were present could not see. Some also reported being pushed or feeling their skin being pricked when no one else was present. Assuming these experiences were real, ergot poisoning provides a plausible explanation.

But could grain in Salem have been contaminated with ergot? Rye, which grows best in low, wet areas and is susceptible to ergot infection was a staple crop in Salem. Accounts from the time indicate that 1691 was an unusually wet year. Since ergot prefers wet conditions, this weather pattern could have set the stage for a rye crop that was heavily infected with the fungus. On top of this, farmland in the western section of Salem consisted primarily of swampy fields, so an ergot infection would have likely been concentrated in this area. So if ergot poisoning was a factor in the bewitching of the accusers in Salem, you would expect most of them to have lived in the western section of town. As it turns out 30 of 32 accusers (excluding the girls) lived on the western side of town while 12 of 14 accused witches lived on the eastern side of town. Since stored grain is eaten throughout the winter, the effects of ergot poisoning on the population would have been cumulative, and in the Spring the witchcraft trials ended abruptly.

In terms of the number of individuals who were executed, the Salem Witch Trials were an anomaly, but they were not unprecedented. Witchcraft was actually a legal offense in the Colonies and witchcraft panics followed by trials and executions periodically played out in Europe. Since Caporael first suggested that ergotism may have sparked the Salem Witch Trials, other historians have investigated the possible role of ergotism in other witchcraft panics in Europe. As in Salem, descriptions of supposedly bewitched individuals during many European witchcraft panics match the symptoms of ergotism, and weather conditions favoring ergot infection often existed before panics. While it’s impossible to prove that an epidemic of ergot poisoning was a factor in the Salem Witch Trials, there is circumstantial evidence that suggests it may have played a role. But even if this was the case, the town’s reaction to a medical crisis was largely shaped by a complicated mixture of cultural, religious, social, and even economic factors.

http://smellslikescience.com/witchcraft-or-psychedelic-trip/