

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID  
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300  
(PMGC)

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

897 U. S. COURT HOUSE  
FOLEY SQUARE  
NEW YORK, NEW YORK

74-1333

Enclosures to Bureau

Re: New York file 65-14920

Kisseloff-23209

Kisseloff-23210

74-1333-4598

## CHAPTER I

Karl Marx has said that the great scenes of history are always enacted twice, the first time as tragedy, the second time as comedy. The Hiss Case reversed the Marxian order; the tragedy to come was prefigured by no solemn drumbeat, no sound of Fate knocking on the door which, when opened, would reveal that the enemy was within the citadel and had been for more than three decades. The great Case began in that style of slipshod buffoonery which had dogged the House Committee on Un-American Activities all through its existence, and, which, played up and exaggerated by countless enemies in the press and public life, reduced almost to nullity the extremely important work the Committee had done in exposing and documenting the Communist conspiracy.

It seems incredible, but it is quite true, that no member of the Committee had more than a gliding of what I might testify if I was called before it. It seems almost as incredible that I had no advance notice from the Committee that it intended to call me as a witness.

I first learned this fact from the press. I was at my desk at Time magazine, when, on Sunday afternoon, Aug. 1, 1948, Washington called and I was told that David Sentner of Hearst's Washington Bureau wanted to speak to me. I had not heard that name for more than thirty years. But I remembered Sentner. When I was a freshman at Columbia College, trying to write poetry and not succeeding very well, I once met Sentner, who was then a student

in the School of Journalism. To me the introduction had been awesome. Sentner was a veteran of the first World War. He not only wrote poetry, he got it published in the campus magazines. He was to me a symbol of worldly experience and literary success. Sentner did not know this, of course -- we so seldom know what is going on behind the eyes observing us.

This flash-back which took only an instant, was the first, though I did not then know it, in an excruciating process of recollection that was to last for two years and amount to an almost total recall of my whole life.

Sentner had no recollection of me. "Are you the Time editor," his voice asked, "who has just been subpoenaed by the House Un-American Committee?" I said that I did not know. A little later the New York Journal American asked the same question. I still did not know the answer.

This comedy occurred because the Committee, before informing me that a subpoena had been issued, had already announced the news to the press in Washington. "Is Chambers a Communist?" one of the newsmen asked Robert Stripling, the Committee's chief investigator. Stripling hemmed and said that he did not know. I do not think he did. But his answer gravelled my peppery friend, Frank McNaughton, who covers the Hill for Time. "I've known Chambers for ten years," he snapped, "and you know damn well that he's no more a Communist than you are, Stripling." His was the first voice raised on my behalf. In a fight, you learn to put a high value on such voices.

I do not wish to give the impression that I did not know that a subpoena might be served. Several months before, a newsman, also an ex-Communist, had dropped into my office one day and told me a

curious story. A young woman, who had formerly worked in a Soviet underground apparatus in Washington, had broken with the Communist Party. Knowing that the Communists have people posted pretty nearly everywhere, she had very sensibly gone to the F.B.I. in Connecticut, where she thought that the danger of eavesdropping would be less than in New York City. She had told her story in great detail. "They asked her," said the newsman, "if she had ever known you. She had never heard your name, but she had heard mention once or twice of 'the man who went sour'." Thus I first heard of Elizabeth Bently, though I did not then learn her name.

I learned it first when the House Committee called her to testify. On pleasant mornings, after the barn work is finished, my wife and I often walk together down our long lane to get the morning mail. This little walk is one of the breathers in our day, when we look around us, note the growth of things we have planted, note the dozens of jobs waiting to be done. It is our quiet time in the sun. One July morning, I drew the local paper out of the mailbox and saw that one Elizabeth Bently was to testify in Washington. I guess that she was the former underground worker. As we walked back, I showed my wife the story. I said: "I think I may be called to testify too." "What will you do?" she asked. I said: "I shall testify."

We walked in silence. On one side, the pasture sloped down steeply past the brook and up to the state road -- a green sweep. On the other side, was the third field I had ever ploughed. When I first turned it under, the wild lettuce was so rank that it reached up to the tractor seat; the rocks were so embedded that they kept breaking the plough point. Now it was a rolling field of alfalfa.

"What about the children?" my wife asked.

"We must be grateful," I said, "that we have brought them along so far in happiness and peace." We did not mention the subject again.

My decision to testify was not made suddenly. What was I in the summer of 1948? I was a highly responsible editor of the world's biggest news magazine and one of its most respected writers. I was a Quaker, that is to say, a man who made few decisions without first seeking the leading of that Inward Light which, friends hold, is the spark of God within in us. I was the husband of an infinitely loving and beloved wife, the father of two beautiful children the care of whose developing souls, clearly apparent in their eyes, seemed to me the seal of God's goodness to me. I was, much more than most people knew or can even perhaps credit, a working farmer. The labor of the fields, and even more, the care and patient work with cattle and sheep, often exhausted me, but it filled me with a gratification, which, had I come to it in my youth would have changed the course of my life. In short, I had, as few men have, those three blessings which give a man a complete life -- love of God, love of family, love of labor. This life my family and I, starting with nothing in 1938, had won by grace, by prayer, by hard work of which my wife had done more than her share.

But I was also an ex-Communist -- an ex-Communist who had worked in the underground, that is to say, close to the heart of the Communist conspiracy. Beyond the limits of my busy life, this force, which I regarded as a force of evil, was moving outward, sometimes lunging, always grinding on, glacierlike and inexorable. The second World War had destroyed the political balance of power

in the world. This had once helped to check the spread of Communism. The Soviet Union had used the war to make enormous territorial advances. As fanatical supporters of the war (after Germany attacked the Soviet Union), the Communists had infiltrated public life in droves.

The United States alone of Christian nations still possessed power to stand against the Communist advance. But nowhere had Communist infiltration been more successful. Nowhere had Communists more cunningly identified themselves with liberals and moderate reformers so that it was almost impossible for the average man to tell them apart. A skilful Communist propaganda, playing upon that love of peace which is one of the deepest instincts of this people, and, when it gets in the way of the political facts of life one of its great weaknesses, had convinced millions that Russia was really peace-loving but insecure. Appeasement alone could reassure her. Thus, Americans felt an immense apathy toward the peril without and the peril within, which were interlocking parts of the same threat.

Through the columns of Time I had long been warning them, to the great annoyance of some of my colleagues, of the peril without. It lay in my power to warn them of the peril within. I was in fact one of the few men who could warn them, for I alone had the facts to warn them with. To do so, I must be willing to relinquish all that I had become, all that I hoped for myself or my children. It seemed to me that I owed a debt that I could repay in no other way, that I had a simple duty to God to relinquish with an easy heart those blessings which He had so freely given us. My duty was to arouse the nation to its danger by testifying publicly to those

facts about Communist infiltration to which I had long testified privately.

Here a special problem arose. I must testify against Communists, that is to say, about other men and women, many of them, like me, the parents of children, all of them human souls though they might deny the existence of the soul. I, by grace, had been given the strength to break with that evil which they still served (if indeed all of them still served it), and time in which to make myself a new life. Why should they too not be given time to find themselves? Why was there not hope of grace for them with which I had no right to interfere? What right had I to tear with a steel plough into the lives of people I had not seen for years, complicating the destiny of souls, which is divine, with the exigencies of struggles which are human? But the ultimate struggle was between the power of good and the power of evil -- remembering always that good and evil seldom come unmixed in life.

This was a problem I had long faced. I had decided on a solution which, for those who have never faced the problem, is easy to condemn. I decided to testify to the fact that certain individuals had infiltrated the Government as underground Communists, but to withhold the fact that they had been engaged in espionage. In this way, I could cripple the conspiracy while shielding the individuals. I thought (quite mistakenly as it turned out) that most of these people would readily admit that they had once been Communists. I thought (also quite mistakenly) that the country would in this way be alerted to the degree and danger of Communist infiltration. I was naive. I have seldom met a man who was not naive about some things -- even rather important things.



After thinking quietly about the telephone call from Washington, I wrote a brief memo to my managing editor. I told him that I expected momentarily to be subpoenaed by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I told him that I believed that any act a man may do, even the simplest, sets up ever widening ripples of evil; that my action might well cause much evil and suffering. But one man must be willing to take upon himself the onus of evil so that other men may be spared greater evil. Someone has always died so that we may sit quietly in our lamplight of an evening. For the sake of his children and my own, so that all children might be spared the evil of Communism, I was going to testify.

The next morning I had coffee with Henry R. Luce, the editor in chief of Time, Life and Fortune. He wanted to discuss a projected article. He had not heard of the expected subpoena. I said: "It seems to me that you will not want me around here any longer." "Nonsense," he said, "testifying is a simple patriotic duty."

A Hearst reporter and photographer were waiting outside my office when I came back. I refused any comment or pictures until the subpoena should arrive. About noon the server appeared, a rather grim-looking man, who presently became as pleasant as only a subpoena server can be when he finds someone who is not dodging him.

A colleague suggested that I should write a brief statement for the Committee. I wrote one quickly. It was read and approved. That evening I took the train for Washington. I was to spend the night with Frank McNaughton, who then lived far out in a northwest suburb of Washington. As we drove along, my cab driver began to talk about his chief interest in life, which was bees. He told me

that he spent most of his time when he was not hacking, working and watching among his hives. He told me about his troubles with swarms, robber bees, weak hives. Probably he had never been to high school. His voice and language were somewhat less than Harvard. But I was impressed by the great detailed knowledge he had of the complicated life of his insects. I thought of him, driving all kinds of irrelevant people (including witnesses before the House Committee) through the snarls of Washington traffic while his mind lingered in his bee-yard. When I got out, he showed me bottles of honey and frames that he kept in the back of the cab -- to give away, he said, but also, I suspect, for the sense of being with the things he loved. So I felt, as I took my first step into the inferno, that, through this chance encounter, the things I also loved, the fields and the life of the earth, were still with me.

Of my midnight talk with Frank McNaughton, I remember only one scrap: "There is one man on the Committee who asks shrewd questions," he said, "Richard Nixon of California."

Kisseloff-23218

Beloved Children,

I am sitting in the kitchen of the little house at Medfield, our second farm, which is cut off by the ridge and a quarter mile across the fields from our home place, where you are. I am alone in the otherwise empty house. I am trying to write you a book. In it I am talking to you. But I am also talking to the world. To both I owe an accounting.

It is a terrible book. It is terrible in what it tells about men. If anything, it is more terrible in what it tells about the world in which you live. It is about what the world calls the Hiss-Chambers Case, or even more simply, the Hiss Case. It is about a spy case. All the props of an espionage case are there -- foreign agents, household traitors, stolen documents, microfilm, furtive meetings, secret hideaways, phony names, an informer, investigations, trials, official justice.

But if the Hiss Case were only this, it would not be worth my writing about or your reading about. It would be another fat folder in the sad files of the police, another crime drama in which the props would be mistaken for the play (as many people have consistently mistaken them). It would not be what alone gave it meaning, what the mass of men and women instinctively sensed it to be, often without/knowning why. It would not be what, at the very beginning, I was moved to call it: "a tragedy of history."

For it was more than human tragedy. Much more than Alger

Hiss or Whittaker Chambers was on trial in the trials of Alger Hiss. Two faiths were on trial. Human societies, like human beings, live by faith and die when faith dies. At issue in the Hiss Case was the question whether this sick society, which we call Western civilization, could in its extremity still cast up a man whose faith in it was so great that he would voluntarily abandon those things which men hold good, including life, to defend it. At issue was the question whether this man's faith could prevail against a man whose equal faith it was that this society is sick beyond saving, and that mercy itself pleads for its swift extinction and replacement by another. At issue was the question whether, in the desperately divided society, there still remained the will to recognize the issues in time to offset the immense rally of public power to distort and pervert the facts.

At heart, the Great Case was this critical conflict of faiths; that is why it was a great case. On a scale personal enough to be felt by all, but big enough to be symbolic, the two irreconcilable faiths of our time -- Communism and Freedom -- came to grips in the persons of two conscious and resolute men. Indeed, it would have been hard, in a world still only dimly aware of what the conflict is about, to find two other men who knew so clearly. Both had been schooled in the same view of history (the Marxist view). Both were trained by the same Party in the same selfless, semi-soldierly discipline. Neither would nor could yield without betraying, not himself, but his faith; and the different character of these faiths was shown by the different conduct of the two men toward each other throughout the struggle. For, with dark certitude, both knew, almost from the

beginning, that the Great Case could end only in the destruction of one or both of the contending figures, just as the history of our times (both men had been taught) can end only in the destruction of one or both of the contending forces.

But this destruction is not the tragedy. The nature of tragedy is itself misunderstood. Part of the world supposes that the tragedy in the Hiss Case lies in the acts of disloyalty revealed. Part believes that the tragedy lies in the fact that an able, intelligent man, Alger Hiss, was cut short in the course of a brilliant public career. Some find it tragic that Whittaker Chambers, of his own will, gave up a \$30,000 a year job and a secure future to haunt for the rest of his days the ruins of his life. These are shocking facts, ugly facts, criminal facts, disturbing facts; they are not tragic.

Crime, violence, infamy are not tragedy. Tragedy occurs when a human soul awakes and seeks, in suffering and pain, to free itself from crime, violence, infamy, even at the cost of life. The struggle is the tragedy -- not defeat or death. That is why the spectacle of tragedy has always filled men, not with despair, but with a sense of hope and exaltation. That is why this terrible book is also a book of hope. For it is about the struggle of the human soul -- of more than one human soul. It is in this sense that the Hiss Case is a tragedy. This is its meaning beyond the headlines, the revelations, the shame and suffering of the people involved. But this tragedy will have been for nothing unless you understand it rightly, and from it the world takes hope and heart to begin its own tragic struggle with evil that besets it from within and without, and ends its days and

fact that the world, the whole world, is sick unto death and that, among other things, this Case has turned a finger of fierce light into the suddenly opened and reeking body of our time.

My children, as long as you live, the shadow of the Hiss Case will brush you. In every pair of eyes that rests on you, you will see pass, like a cloud passing behind a woods in winter, the memory of your father -- dissembled in friendly eyes, lurking in unfriendly eyes. Sometimes you will wonder which is harder to bear: friendly forgiveness or forthright hate. In time, therefore, when the sum of your experience of life gives you authority, you will ask yourselves the question: What was my father?

I will give you an answer: I was a witness. I do not mean a witness for the Government or against Alger Hiss and the others. Nor do I mean the short, squat, solitary figure, trudging through the impersonal halls of public buildings to testify before Congressional committees, grand juries, loyalty boards, courts of law. A man is not primarily a witness against something. That is only incidental to the fact that he is a witness for something. A witness, in the sense that I am using the word, is a man whose life and faith are so completely one that when the challenge comes to step out and testify for his faith, he does so, disregarding all risks, accepting all consequences.

One day in the great jury room of the Grand Jury of the Southern District of New York, a juror leaned forward slightly and asked me: "Mr. Chambers, what does it mean to be a Communist?" I hesitated for a moment, trying to find the simplest, most direct

way to convey the heart of this complex experience to men and women to whom the very fact of the experience was all but incomprehensible. Then I said:

"When I was a Communist, I had three heroes. One was a Russian. One was a Pole. One was a German Jew.

"The Pole was Felix Djerjinsky. He was ascetic, highly sensitive, intelligent. He was a Communist. After the Russian Revolution, he became head of the Tcheka and organizer of the Red Terror. As a young man, Djerjinsky had been a political prisoner in the Pawiak Prison in Warsaw. There he insisted on being given the task of cleaning the latrines of the other prisoners. For he held that the most developed member of any community must take upon himself the lowliest tasks as an example to those who are less developed. That is one thing that it meant to be a Communist.

The German Jew was Eugen Levine. He was a Communist. During the Bavarian Soviet Republic, in 1919, Levine was the organizer of the Workers and Soldiers Soviets. When the Bavarian Soviet Republic was crushed, Levine was captured by the German army and court martialed. The court martial told him: "You are under sentence of death." Levine answered: "We Communists are always under sentence of death." That is another thing that it meant to be a Communist.

"The Russian was not a Communist. He was a pre-Communist revolutionist named Kalyaev. He was arrested for a very minor part in the assassination of the Tsarist prime minister, von Plehve. He was sent into Siberian exile to one of the worst prison camps, where the political prisoners were flogged. Kalyaev sought some way to protest this outrage to the world. The means

The means were few, but at last he found a way. In protest against the flogging of other men, Kalyaev drenched himself in kerosene, set himself on fire and burned himself to death. That also is what it meant to be a Communist."

That also is what it means to be a witness.

But a man may also be an involuntary witness. I do not know any way to explain why God's grace touches a man who seems unworthy of it, and is withheld from another man who strives devoutly for it. But neither do I know any other way to explain how a man like myself -- tarnished by life, unprepossessing, not brave -- could prevail so far against the powers of the world arrayed almost solidly against him, to destroy him and defeat his truth. In this sense, I am an involuntary witness to God's grace and to the fortifying power of faith.

It was my fate to be in turn a witness to each of the two great faiths of our time. And so we come to the terrible word, Communism. My very dear children, nothing in all these pages will be written so much for you, though it is so unlike anything you would want to read. In nothing shall I be so much a witness, in no way am I so much called upon to fulfill my task, as in trying to make clear to you (and to the world) the true nature of Communism and the source of its power, which was the cause of my ordeal as a man, and remains the historic ordeal of the world in the 20th century. For in this century, within the next decades, will be decided for generations whether all mankind is to become Communist, whether the whole world is to become free, or whether, in



the struggle, civilization, as we know it, is to be completely destroyed or completely changed. It is our fate to live upon that turning point in history.

The world has reached that turning point by the steep stages of a crisis mounting for generations. The turning point is the next to the last step. It was reached in blood, sweat, tears, havoc and death in World War II. The chief fruit of the first World War was the Russian Revolution and the rise of Communism as a national power. The chief fruit of the second World War was our arrival at the next to the last step of the crisis with the rise of Communism to a world power. History is likely to say that these were the only decisive results of the world wars.

The last War simplified the balance of political forces in the world by reducing them to two. For the first time, it made the power of the Communist sector of mankind (embodied in the Soviet Union) roughly equal to the power of the free sector of mankind (embodied in the United States). It made the collision of these powers all but inevitable. For the world wars did not end the crisis. They raised its tensions to a new pitch. They raised the crisis to a new stage. All the politics of our time, including the politics of war, will be the politics of this crisis.

Few men are so dull that they do not know that the crisis exists and that it threatens their lives at every point. It is popular to call it a social crisis. It is in fact a total crisis -- religious, moral, intellectual, social, political, economic. It is popular to call it a crisis of the Western world. It is in fact a crisis of the whole world. Communism, which claims to be a solution of the crisis, is itself a symptom and an irritant.

of the crisis.

In part, the crisis results from the impact of science and technology upon mankind which, neither socially nor morally, has caught up with the problems posed by that impact. In part, it is caused by men's efforts to solve those problems. World wars are the military expression of the crisis. Worldwide depressions are its economic expression. Universal desperation is its spiritual climate. This is the climate of Communism. Communism in our time can no more be considered apart from the crisis than a fever can be acted upon apart from an infected body.

I see in Communism the focus of the concentrated evil of our time. You will ask: Why, then, do men become Communists? How did it happen that you, our gentle and loved father, were once a Communist? Were you simply stupid? No, I was not stupid. Were you morally depraved? No, I was not morally depraved. Indeed, educated men become Communists chiefly for moral reasons. Did you not know that the crimes and horrors of Communism are inherent in Communism? Yes, I knew that fact. Then why did you become a Communist? It would help more to ask: How did it happen that this movement, once a mere muttering of political outcasts, became this immense force that now contests the mastery of mankind? Even when all the chances and mistakes of history are allowed for, the answer must be: Communism makes some profound appeal to the human mind. You will not find out what it is by calling Communism names. That will not help much to explain why Communism whose horrors, on a scale unparalleled in history, are now public knowledge, still recruits its thousands and holds its millions -- among them some of the best minds alive. Look at Klaus Fuchs, standing in the

London dock, quiet, doomed, destroyed, and say whether it is possible to answer in that way the simple question: Why?

First, let me try to say what Communism is not. It is not simply a vicious plot hatched by wicked men in a sub-cellar. It is not just the writings of Marx and Lenin, dialectical materialism, the politburo, the labor theory of value, the theory of the general strike, the Red Army, secret police, labor camps, underground conspiracy, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the technique of the coup d'etat. It is not even those chanting, bannered millions that stream periodically, like disorganized armies, through the heart of the world's capitals: Moscow, New York, Tokyo, Paris, Rome. These are expressions of Communism, but they are not what Communism is about.

In the Hiss trials, where Communism was a haunting specter, but which did little or nothing to explain Communism, Communists were assumed to be criminals, pariahs, clandestine men who lead double lives under false names, travel on false passports, deny traditional religion, morality, the sanctity of oaths, preach violence and practise treason. These things are true about Communists, but they are not what Communism is about.

The revolutionary heart of Communism is not the theatrical appeal: "Workers of the world, unite. You have nothing to lose but your chains. You have a world to gain." It is a simple statement of Friedrich Engels, further simplified for handy use: "Philosophers have explained the world; it is necessary to change the world." Communists are bound together by no secret oath. The tie that binds them across the frontiers of nations, across barriers of language and differences of class and education, in defiance of

religion, morality, truth, law, honor, the weaknesses of the body and the irresolutions of the mind, even unto death, is a simple conviction: It is necessary to change the world. Their power, whose nature baffles the rest of the world, because in a large measure the rest of the world has lost that power, is the power to hold convictions and to act on them. It is the same power that moves mountains; it is also an unfailing power to move men. Communists are that part of mankind which has recovered the power to live or die -- to bear witness -- for its faith. And it is a simple, rational faith that inspires men to live or die for it.

It is not new. It is, in fact, man's second oldest faith. Its promise was whispered in the first days of the Creation under the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil; "Ye shall be as gods." It is the great alternative faith of mankind. Like all great faiths, its force derives from a simple vision. Other ages have had great visions. They have always been different versions of the same vision: The vision of God and man's relationship to God. The Communist vision is the vision of Man without God.

It is the vision of man's mind displacing God as the creative intelligence of the world. It is the vision of man's liberated mind, by the sole force of its rational intelligence, re-directing man's destiny and reorganizing man's life and the world. It is the vision of man, once more the central figure of the Creation, not because God made man in His image, but because man's mind makes him the most intelligent of the animals. Copernicus and his successors displaced man as the central fact of the universe. Communism restores man to his sovereignty by the simple method of denying God.

The vision is a challenge and implies a threat. It challenges man to prove by his acts that he is the masterwork of the Creation -- by making thought and act one. It challenges him to prove it by using the force of his rational mind to end the bloody meaninglessness of man's history -- by giving it purpose and a plan. It challenges him to prove it by reducing the meaningless chaos of nature, by imposing on it his rational will to order, abundance, security, peace. It is the vision of materialism. But it threatens, if man's mind is unequal to the problems of man's progress, that he will sink back into savagery (the A and the H bombs have raised the issue in explosive form), until nature replaces him with a more intelligent form of life.

It is an intensely practical vision. The tools to turn it into reality are at hand -- science and technology, whose traditional method, the rigorous exclusion of all supernatural factors in solving problems, has contributed to the intellectual climate in which the vision flourishes, just as they have contributed to the crisis in which Communism thrives. For the vision is shared by millions who are not Communists (they are part of Communism's secret strength). Its first commandment is found, not in the Communist Manifesto, but in the first sentence of the physics primer: "All of the progress of mankind to date results from the making of careful measurements." But Communism, for the first time in history, has made this vision the faith of a great modern political movement.

Hence the Communist Party is quite justified in calling itself the most revolutionary party in history. It has posed in practical form the most revolutionary question in history: God or Man? It has taken the logical next step which three hundred years

of rationalism hesitated to take, and said what millions of modern minds think, but do not dare or care to say: If man's mind is the decisive force in the world, what need is there for God?; henceforth man's mind is man's fate.

This vision is the Communist revolution, which, like all great revolutions, occurs in man's mind before it takes form in man's acts. Insurrection and conspiracy are merely methods of realizing the vision; they are merely part of the politics of Communism. Without its vision, they, like Communism, would have no meaning and could not rally a parcel of pickpockets. Communism does not summon men to crime or to utopia, as its easy critics like to think. On the plane of faith, it summons mankind to turn its vision into practical reality. On the plane of action, it summons men to struggle against inertia, special interest, ignorance, which, embodied in social, political and economic forms, Communism claims are blocking the will of mankind to make its next great forward stride. It summons men to overcome the crisis, which Communism claims, is in effect a crisis of rending frustration, with the world, unable to stand still, but unwilling to go forward along the road that the logic of a technological civilization points out -- Communism.

This is Communism's moral sanction, which is twofold. Its vision points the way to the future; its faith labors to turn the future into present reality. It says to every man who joins it: the vision is a practical problem of history; the way to achieve it is a practical problem of politics, which is the present tense of history. Have you the moral strength to take upon yourself the crimes of history so that man at last may close his chronicle of

age-old, senseless suffering, and replace it with purpose and a plan? The answer a man makes to this question is the difference between the Communist and those miscellaneous socialists, liberals, fellow travellers, unclassified progressives and men of good will, all of whom share the same vision, but do not share the faith because they will not take upon themselves the penalties of the faith. The answer is the root of that sense of moral superiority which makes Communists, though caught in crime, berate their opponents with withering self-righteousness.

The Communist vision has a mighty agitator and a mighty propagandist. They are the crisis. The agitator needs no soap box. It speaks insistently to the human mind at the point where desperation lurks. The propagandist writes no Communist gibberish. It speaks insistently to the human mind at the point where man's hope and man's energy fuse to fierceness.

The vision inspires. The crisis impels. The workingman is chiefly moved by the crisis. The educated man is chiefly moved by the vision. The workingman, living upon a mean margin of life, can afford few visions -- even practical visions. An educated man, peering from the Harvard Yard, or any college campus, upon a world in chaos, finds in the vision the two certainties for which the mind of man tirelessly seeks: a reason to live and a reason to die. No other faith of our time presents them with the same practical intensity. That is why Communism is the central experience of the first half of the 20th century, and may be its final experience -- will be, unless the free world, in the agony of its

struggle with Communism, overcomes its crisis by discovering, in suffering and pain, a power of faith which will provide man's

mind, at the same intensity, with the same two certainties; a reason to live and a reason to die. If it fails, this will be the century of the great social wars. If it succeeds, this will be the century of the great wars of faith.

You will ask: Why, then, do men cease to be Communists?

One answer is: Very few do. Thirty years after the Russian Revolution, after the known atrocities, the purges, the revelations, the jolting zigzags of Communist politics, there is only a handful of ex-Communists in the whole world. By ex-Communists I do not mean those who break with Communism over differences of strategy and tactics (like Trotsky) or organization (like Tito). Those are merely quarrels over a road map by people all of whom are in a hurry to get to the same place.

Nor, by ex-Communists, do I mean those thousands who continually drift into the Communist Party and out again. The turnover is vast. These are the spiritual vagrants of our time whose traditional faith has been leached out in the bland climate of rationalism. They are looking for an intellectual night's lodging. They lack the character for Communist faith because they lack the character for any faith. So they drop away though Communism keeps its hold on them.

By an ex-Communist, I mean a man who knew clearly why he became a Communist, who served Communism devotedly and knew why he served it, who broke with Communism unconditionally and knew why he broke with it. Of these there are very few -- an index to



the power of the vision and the power of the crisis.

History very largely fixes the patterns of force that make men Communists. Hence one Communist conversion sounds much like another -- rather impersonal and repetitious, awesome and tiresome, like long lines of similar people all stolidly waiting to get in to see the same movie. A man's break with Communism is intensely personal. Hence the account of no two breaks is likely to be the same. The reasons that made one Communist break may seem without force to another ex-Communist. Arthur Koestler, the author of Darkness At Noon, is a man for whom I share with a great part of the world a great admiration. I recently read his account of his reasons for breaking with the Communist Party. I thought: such reasons would not have driven me out of the Audubon Society. I also found his reasons for joining the Communist Party, while perfectly sincere, curiously incomplete.

It is a fact that a man can join the Communist Party, can be very active in it for years, without completely understanding the nature of Communism or the political methods that follow inevitably from its vision. One day such incomplete Communists discover that the Communist Party is not what they thought it was. They break with it and turn on it with the rage of an honest dupe, a dupe who has given a part of his life to a swindle. Often they forget that it takes two to make a swindle.

Others remain Communists for years, warned by the light of its vision, firmly closing their eyes to the crimes and horrors inseparable from its practical politics. One day they have to face the facts. They are appalled at what they have abetted. They spend the rest of their days trying to explain, usually

without great success, the dark clue to their complicity. As their understanding of Communism was incomplete and led them to a dead end, their understanding of breaking with it is incomplete and leads them to a dead end. It leads to less than Communism, which was a vision and a faith. The world outside Communism, the world in crisis, lacks a vision and a faith. There is before these ex-Communists absolutely nothing. Behind them is a threat. For they have, in fact, broken not with the vision, but with the politics of the vision. In the name of reason and intelligence, the vision keeps them firmly in its grip -- self-divided, paralyzed, powerless to act against it.

Hence the most secret fold of their minds is haunted by a terrifying thought: What if we were wrong? What if our inconstancy is our guilt? That is the fate of those who break without knowing clearly that Communism is wrong because something else is right, because to the challenge: God or Man?, they continue to give the answer: Man. Their pathos is that not even the Communist ordeal could teach them that man without God is just what Communism said he was: the most intelligent of the animals, that man without God is a beast, never more beastly than when he is most intelligent about his beastliness. "Er nennt's Vernunft," says the Devil in Goethe's Faust, "und braucht's allein, noch tierlicher als jeder Tier zu sein" -- Man calls it Reason and uses it simply to be more beastly than any beast. Not grasping the source of the evil they sincerely hate, such ex-Communists in general make ineffectual witnesses against it. They are witnesses against something; they have ceased to be witnesses for anything.

Yet there is one experience which most sincere ex-Communists

share, whether they go only part way or to the end of the question it poses. The daughter of a former German consul general in Moscow was trying to explain to me why her father, who, as an enlightened modern man, had been extremely pro-Communist, had become an implacable anti-Communist. It was hard for her because, as an enlightened modern girl, she shared the Communist vision without being a Communist. But she loved her father and the irrationality of his defection embarrassed her. "He was immensely pro-Soviet," she said, "and then -- you will laugh at me -- but you must not laugh at my father -- and then -- one night -- in Moscow -- he heard screams. That's all. Simply one night he heard screams."

A child of Reason and the 20th century, she knew that there is a logic of the mind. She did not know that the soul has a logic that may be more compelling than the mind's. She did not know at all that she had swept away the logic of the mind, the logic of history, the logic of politics, the myth of the 20th century, with five annihilating words: One night he heard screams.

What Communist has not heard those screams? They come from husbands torn forever from their wives in midnight arrests. They come, muffled, from the execution cellars of the secret police, from the torture chambers of the Lubianka, from all the citadels of terror now stretching from Berlin to Canton. They come from those freight cars loaded with men, women and children, the enemies of the Communist State, locked in, packed in, left on remote sidings to freeze to death at night in the Russian winter. They come from minds driven mad by the horrors of mass starvation ordered and enforced as a policy of the Communist State. They come from the starved skeletons, worked to death, then flogged to death,

(as an example to others) in the freezing filth of sub-arctic labor camps. They come from children whose parents are suddenly, inexplicably, taken away from them -- parents they will never see again.

What Communist has not heard those screams? Execution, says the Communist code, is the highest measure of social protection. What man can call himself a Communist who has not accepted the fact that Terror is an instrument of policy, right if the vision is right, justified by history, enjoined by the balance of forces in the social wars of this century? Those screams have reached every Communist's mind. Usually they stop there. What judge willingly dwells upon the man the laws compel him to condemn to death -- the laws of nations or the laws of history?

But one day the Communist really hears those screams. He is going about his routine Party tasks. He is lifting a dripping reel of microfilm from a developing tank. He is justifying to a Communist fraction in a trade union an extremely unwelcome directive of the Central Committee. He is receiving from a trusted superior an order to go to another country and, in a designated hotel, at a designated hour, meet a man whose name he will never know, but who will give him a package whose contents he will never learn. Suddenly, there closes around that Communist a separating silence, and in that silence he hears screams. He hears them for the first time. For they do not merely reach his mind. They pierce beyond. They pierce to his soul. He says to himself: "Those are not the screams of man in agony. Those are the screams of a soul in agony." He hears them for the first time because a

soul in extremity has communicated with that which alone can hear it -- another human soul.

Why does the Communist ever hear them? Because in the end there persists in every man, however he may deny it, a scrap of soul. The Communist who suffers this singular experience, then says to himself: "What is happening to me? I must be sick." If he does not instantly stifle that scrap of soul, he is lost. If he admits it for a moment, he has admitted that there is something greater than Reason, greater than the logic of mind, of politics, of history, of economics, which alone justify the vision. If the Party senses his weakness, and the Party is peculiarly cunning at sensing such weakness, it will humiliate him, degrade him, condemn him, expel him. If it can, it will destroy him. And the Party will be right. For he has betrayed that which alone justifies its faith -- the vision of Almighty Man. He has brushed the only vision that has force against the vision of Almighty Mind. He stands before the fact of God.

The Communist Party is familiar with this experience to which its members are sometimes liable in prison, in illness, in indecision. It is recognized frankly as a sickness. There are ways of treating it -- if it is confessed. It is when it is not confessed that the Party, sensing a subtle crisis, turns upon it savagely. What ex-Communist has not suffered this experience in one form or another, to one degree or another? What he does about it depends on the individual man. That is why no ex-Communist dare answer for his sad fraternity the question: Why do men break with Communism? He can only answer the question: How did you break with Communism? My answer is: Slowly, reluctantly, in agony.

Yet my break began long before I heard those screams. Perhaps it does for everyone. I do not know how far back it began. Avalanches gather force and crash, unheard, in men as in the mountains. But I date my break from a very casual happening. I was sitting in our apartment on St. Paul Street in Baltimore. It was shortly before we moved to Alger Hiss's apartment in Washington. My daughter was in her high chair. I was watching her eat. She was the most miraculous thing that had ever happened in my life. I liked to watch her even when she smeared porridge on her face or dropped it meditatively on the floor. My eye came to rest on the delicate convolutions of her ear -- those intricate, perfect ears. The thought passed through my mind: "No, those ears were not created by any chance coming together of atoms in nature (the Communist view). They could have been created only by immense design." The thought was involuntary and unwanted. I crowded it out of my mind. But I never wholly forgot it or the occasion. I had to crowd it out of my mind. If I had completed it, I should have had to say: Design presupposes God. I did not then know that, at that moment, the finger of God was first laid upon my forehead.

One thing most ex-Communists could agree upon: they broke because they wanted to be free. They do not all mean the same thing by "free." Freedom is a need of the soul, and nothing else. It is in striving toward God that the soul strives continually after a condition of freedom. God alone is the inciter and guarantor of freedom. He is the only guarantor. External freedom is only an aspect of interior freedom. Political freedom, as the Western world has known it, is only a political reading of the Bible. Religion and freedom are indivisible. Without freedom

the soul dies. Without the soul there is no justification for freedom. Necessity is the only justification known to the mind. Hence every sincere break with Communism is a religious experience, though the Communist fail to identify its true nature, though he fail to go to the end of the experience. His break is the political expression of the perpetual need of the soul whose first faint stirring he has felt within him, years, months or days before he breaks. A Communist breaks because he must choose at last between irreconcilable opposites -- God or Man, Soul or Mind, Freedom or Communism.

Communism is what happens when, in the name of Mind, men free themselves from God. But its view of God, its knowledge of God, its experience of God, is what alone gives character to a society or a nation, and meaning to its destiny. Its culture, the voice of this character, is merely that view, knowledge, experience, of God, fixed by its most intense spirits in terms intelligible to the mass of men. There has never been a society or a nation without God. But history is cluttered with the wreckage of nations that became indifferent to God, and died.

The crisis of Communism exists to the degree in which it has failed to free the peoples that it rules from God. Nobody knows this better than the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The crisis of the Western world exists to the degree in which it is indifferent to God. It exists to the degree in which the Western world actually shares Communism's materialist vision, is so dazzled by the logic of the Communist interpretation of history, politics and economics, that it fails to grasp that, for it, the only possible answer to the Communist challenge: Faith in God or Faith in Man? is the challenge: Faith in God.

Economics is not the central problem of this century. It is a relative problem which can be solved in relative ways. Faith is the central problem of this age. The Western world does not know it, but it already possesses the answer to this problem--but only provided that its faith in God and the freedom He enjoins is as great as Communism's faith in Man.

My dear children, before I close this foreword, I want to recall to you briefly the life that we led in the ten years between the time when I broke with Communism and the time when I began to testify --the things we did, worked for, loved, believed in. For it was that happy life, which, on the human side, alone made it possible for me to do later on the things I had to do, or endure the things that happened to me.

Those were the days of the happy little worries, which then seemed so big. We know now that they were the golden days. They will not come again. In those days, our greatest worry was how to meet the payments on the mortgage, how to get the ploughing done in time, how to get health accreditation for our herd, how to get the hay in before the rain. I used to take my vacation in hay harvest so that I could help work the load. You two little fellows used to trample the load, drive the hay truck in the fields when you could barely reach the foot pedals, or drive the tractor that pulled up the loaded harpoons to the mow. At evening, you would break off to help Mother milk when I went on haying. For we came of age on the farm when we decided not to hire barn help, but to run the herd ourselves as a family.

Often the ovenlike heat in the comb of the barn and the sweet smell of alfalfa made us sick. Sometimes we fell asleep at the supper table from fatigue. But the hard work was good for us; and you knew only the peace of a home governed by a father and mother



whose marriage the years (and an earlier suffering which you could not remember) had deepened into the perfect love that enveloped you.

Mother was a slight, overalled figure forever working for you in the house or beside you in the barns and gardens. Papa was a squat, overalled figure, fat but forceful, who taught John, at nine, the man-size glory of driving the tractor; or sat beside Ellen, at the wheel of the truck, an embodiment of security and power, as we drove loads of cattle through the night. On summer Sundays, you sat between papa and mama in the Quaker meeting house. Through the open doors, as you tried not to twist and turn in the long silence, you could see the far, blue Maryland hills and hear the redbirds and ground robins in the graveyard behind.

Only Ellen had a vague, troubled recollection of another time and another image of papa. Then (it was during the years 1938 and 1939), if for any reason she pattered down the hall at night, she would find papa, with the light on, writing, with a revolver on the table or a gun against the chair. She knew that there were people who wanted to kill papa and who might try to kidnap her. But a wide sea of sunlight and of time lay between that puzzling recollection and the farm.

The farm was your kingdom, and the world lay far beyond the protecting walls thrown up by work and love. It is true that comic strips were not encouraged, comic books were banned, the radio could be turned on only by permission which was seldom given (or asked), and you saw few movies. But you grew in the presence of eternal wonders. There was the birth of lambs and calves. You remember how once, when I was away and the veterinarian could not come, you saw mother reach in and turn the calf inside the cow so that it could be

born. There was also the death of animals, sometimes violent, sometimes slow and painful -- nothing is more constant on a farm than death.

Sometimes, of a spring evening, papa would hear that distant honking that always makes his scalp tingle, and we would all rush out to see the wild geese, in lines of hundreds, steer up from the southwest, turn over the barn as over a landmark, and head into the north. Or on autumn nights of sudden cold, that set the ewes breeding in the orchard, papa would call you out of the house to stand with him in the now celebrated pumpkin patch and watch the northern lights flicker in electric clouds on the horizon, mount, die down, fade and mount again till they filled the whole northern sky with ghostly light in motion.

Thus, as children, you experienced two of the most important things men ever know -- the wonder of life and the wonder of the universe, the wonder of life within the wonder of the universe. More important, you knew them not from books, not from lectures, but simply from living among them. Most important, you knew them with reverence and awe -- that reverence and awe that has died out of the modern world and been replaced by man's monkeylike amazement at the cleverness of his own inventive brain.

I have watched greatness touch you in another way. I have seen you sit, uninvited and unforced, listening in complete silence to the third movement of the Ninth Symphony. I thought you understood, as much as children can, when I told you that that music was the moment at which Beethoven finally passed beyond the suffering of his life on earth and reached for the hand of God, as God reaches for the hand of Adam in Michelangelo's vision of the Creation.

And once, in place of a bedtime story, I was reading John Shakespeare -- at his own request, for I never forced such things on you. I came to that passage in which McBeth, having murdered Duncan, realizes what he has done to his own soul, and asks if all the water in the world can ever wash the blood from his hand, or will it not rather

The multitudinous seas incarnading?

At that line, John's whole body twitched. I gave great silent thanks to God. For I knew that if, as children, you could thus feel in your souls the reverence and awe for life and the world, which is the ultimate meaning of Beethoven and Shakespeare, as men and women you could never be satisfied with less. I felt a great faith that sooner or later you would understand what I once told you, not because I expected you to understand it then, but because I hoped that you would remember it later: "True wisdom comes from the overcoming of suffering and sin. All true wisdom is therefore touched with sadness

If all this sounds unduly solemn, you know that our lives were not; that all of us suffer from an incurable itch to puncture false solemnity. In our daily lives, we were fun-loving and gay. For those who have solemnity in their souls, generally have enough of it there, and do not need to force it into their faces.

Then, on August 3, 1948, you learned for the first time that your father had once been a Communist, that he had worked in something called "the underground," that it was shameful, and <sup>Kisseloff-23243</sup> that for some reason he was in Washington telling the world about it. While he was in the underground, he testified, he had worked with a number of other Communists. One of them was a man with the odd name of Alger Hiss. Later, Alger Hiss denied the allegation. Thus the Great

Case began, and with it our lives were changed forever.

Dear children, one autumn twilight, when you were much smaller, I slipped away from you in play and stood for a moment alone in the apple orchard near the barn. Then I heard your two voices, piping together anxiously, calling to me: "Papa! Papa!" from the harvested cornfield. In the years when I was away five days a week in New York, working to pay for the farm, I used to think of you both before I fell asleep at night. And that is how you almost always came to me -- voices of beloved children, calling to me from the gathered fields at dusk.

You called to me once again at night in the same orchard. That was a good many years later. A shadow deeper and more chilling than the autumn evening had closed upon us -- I mean the Hiss Case. It was the first year of the Case. We had been doing the evening milking together. For us, one of the few happy results of the Case was that at last I could be home with you most of the time (in life these good things usually come too little or too late). I was washing and disinfecting the cows, and putting on and taking off the milkers. You were stripping after me.

In the quiet, there suddenly swept over my mind a clear realization of our true position -- obscure, all but friendless people (some of my great friends had already taken refuge in aloofness; the others I had withdrawn from so as not to involve them in my affairs). Against me was an almost solid line-up of the most powerful groups and men in the country, the bitterly hostile reaction of much of the press, the smiling scepticism of much of the public, the venomous calumnies of the Hiss forces, the all but universal failure to understand the real meaning of the Case or my real

purpose. A sense of the enormous futility of my effort, and my own inadequacy, drowned me. I felt a physical cold creep through me, settle around my heart and freeze any pulse of hope. The sight of you children, guiltless and defenseless, was more than I could bear. I was alone against the world; my longing was to be left completely alone, or not to be at all. It was that death of the will which Communism, with great cunning, always tries to induce in its victims.

I waited until the last cow was stripped and the last can lifted into the cooler. Then I stole into the upper barn and out into the apple orchard. It was a very dark night. The stars were large and cold. This cold was one with the coldness in myself. The lights of the barn, the house and the neighbors' houses were warm in the windows and on the ground; they were not for me. Then I heard Ellen call me in the barn and John called: "Papa!" Still calling, Ellen went down to the house, to see if I were there. I heard John opening gates as he went to the calf barn, and he called me there. With all the longing of my love for you, I wanted to answer. But if I answered, I must come back to the living world. I could not do that.

John began to call me in the cow stable, in the milk house. He went into the dark side of the barn (I heard him slide the door back), into the upper barn, where at night he is usually afraid. He stepped outside in the dark, calling: "Papa! Papa!" -- then, frantically, on the verge of tears: "Papa!" I walked over to him. I felt that I was making the most terrible surrender I should have to make on earth. "Papa," he cried and threw his arms around me,

"don't ever go away." "No," I said, "no, I won't ever go away." Both of us knew that the words "go away" stood for something else, and that I had given him my promise not to kill myself. Later on, as you will see, I was tempted, in my wretchedness, to break that promise.

My children, when you were little, we used sometimes to go for walks in our pine woods. In the open fields, you would run along by yourselves. But you used instinctively to give me your hands as we entered those woods, where it was darker, lonelier, and in the stillness our voices sounded loud and frightening. In this book I am again giving you my hands. I am leading you, not through cool pine woods, but up and up a narrow defile between bare and steep rocks from which in shadow things uncoil and slither away. It will be dark. But, in the end, if I have led you aright, you will make out three crosses, from two of which hang thieves. I will have brought you to Golgotha -- the place of skulls. This is the meaning of the journey. Before you understand, I may not be there, my hands may have slipped from yours. It will not matter. For when you understand what you see, you will no longer be children. You will know that life is pain, that each of us hangs always upon the cross of himself. And when you know that this is true of every man, woman and child on earth, you will be wise.

Your Father

Kisseloff-23246