
THE COMMUNIST PARTY AND NATIONAL UNITY

BY EARL BROWDER

[Editorial Note: The following is a chapter from a forthcoming book by Earl Browder, a work of great significance to our nation for the attainment of victory by the United Nations over Hitler and the Axis and for securing a just peace. The book will be issued by International Publishers in October, under the title Victory—and After. The selection is here presented by courtesy of the publishers.]

SINCE I am writing as a spokesman for the Communist Party of the U.S.A., it may be expected that I deal with my own party in relation to national unity, before speaking in detail of other parties. This is especially necessary because Hitler, with his agents and sympathizers in every country, has made the creed of "anti-communism" his chief secret weapon for disrupting the national unity of all nations in preparing to conquer and enslave them. And nowhere has Hitler made more effective use of this weapon than in the United States; he has mobilized his forces directly against President Roosevelt himself, openly under the slogans of the fight against communism.

Recently I received an eloquent letter, running to about six thousand words, on this subject, from an ardent New Dealer whose social status may be inferred from the embossed letterhead on fine linen paper. The crux of this gentleman's proposal for settling the issue of the Communist Party and communism was that the party should dissolve itself and each ex-member should commit suicide.

Communists are expected to give serious answers to all proposals, even this one. Let us therefore begin by explaining to the gentleman, and those who think along similar lines, why the Communist Party cannot agree to the desirability of suicide as a means of disarming Hitler.

Ignoring the obvious answer, that universal human experience has long demonstrated the futility of suicide as the solution of any problem, we will explain why the measure would fail in this particular case.

Thomas Jefferson was denounced as a communist and red by the Federalists, before and after his elevation to the Presidency, and it was no answer at all to point out that

there was no Communist Party.

Andrew Jackson was denounced as a communist and red, and he had to fight through the issues of his day on their merits despite the fact that there was then no Communist Party in the United States.

Abraham Lincoln was denounced as a communist and red, both by the slave power and by Northern Copperheads. In his time there were American Communists, as well as an international Communist organization, but Lincoln did not ask them to commit suicide. Instead he commissioned their American leaders as officers in the Union Army, and expressed his gratitude to the international Communist organization (the First International) for its help to the Union cause in Europe. It clearly would have done him no good for the Communists of his time to commit suicide.

Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln were the chief figures in establishing the American tradition of a self-governing democracy. All three were the victims of "red-baiting," but not one of them ever himself descended to red-baiting.

There is no reason today for any attempt to revise the tradition of these three great Americans. The Communist Party has its place in the great American tradition, and our democracy would only be the poorer without it.

Why then the outcry against the Communist Party? Why the near-hysteria with which this question is surrounded in our public life? Why are so many persons ready to exclude American Communists

from the rights and privileges guaranteed to all citizens under the Constitution, solely on the grounds of their political opinions? Why are they ready to proclaim the bankruptcy of the democratic process in dealing with communism?

We have already indicated in an earlier chapter what is the real power behind the anti-communist campaign. I intend to show even the most sceptical reader that it is Hitler Germany.

Surely, every patriotic American knows by this time that Hitler's great campaign against the German Communist Party was part and parcel of his campaign to conquer the world. When other German political parties joined in Hitler's war cry, they gave Hitler the help he required to seize complete power, but in so doing they sealed their own death warrant, only a few months postdated.

Surely, every patriotic American knows that Hitler's boasted "crusade against Bolshevism" on an international scale had its final aim to conquer and loot the United States itself. When other nations allowed themselves to be divided on this issue, they fell victim to Hitler's panzer divisions.

When France reached her supreme crisis, the Laval and Pétains, agents of Hitler, seized power from within for their master, under cover of a campaign of expelling the French Communists from the Chamber of Deputies and Senate, and arresting Communists wholesale, with the agreement and cooperation of all other parties. But when the smoke cleared away Hit-

ler's agents were in complete control of the country, the other parties had also been destroyed, and France had been laid prostrate under the Nazi regime.

The issue of communism, in this Hitlerian form, is beyond the slightest doubt Hitler's secret weapon for world conquest.

Still, there are many innocent dupes of Hitler. For the benefit of these, the issues must be explained again and again. And no one has appeared as yet who can explain it better than the Communists themselves. That is one of the great services we Communists have to render the United Nations.

When did the "anti-communist" war cry begin to rise to frantic tones in the United States? Remember? It was in 1933. It was at the moment when the real menace, Hitler, had just come to power in Germany. It drugged the world to the real danger.

Who began the job in the United States? Remember? It was Mr. Hamilton Fish, together with sundry associates, *openly acting as a branch office of Hitler's Berlin propaganda bureau!*

In 1933 Hitler set up what he called the "General League of German Anti-Communist Associations," with headquarters in Europa House, Berlin. This organization initiated an "International Committee to Combat the World Menace of Communism," with its connections in all countries—the original form of the "Antikomintern Axis." This committee had a section in the United States. This American Section published Hitler's first big propa-

ganda gun in this country—openly as his agents. They distributed this book throughout the United States in enormous quantities, free of charge. Here is a photostatic reproduction of two pages from the book, which furnished the model for Martin Dies' report in 1940, and for Fritz Coudert's report to the New York Legislature in 1942 (New York Legislative Document No. 49):

"We are informed that it is intended to publish an official collection of the judgments of the Supreme Court in connection with the Communist conspiracy. It is to be hoped that the General League will be able to exhibit these documents in an Anti-Communist Museum which is shortly to be established in Berlin. By means of this and other works and publications the General League will be able to enlighten the German nation and the international public opinion with regard to the real aims and doings of the Communist Internationale and to invite attention to the terrible danger which it represents for all nations.

"General League of German Anti-Communist Associations, Europa House, Berlin."

"At the beginning of this year there were weeks when we were within a hair's breadth of Bolshevik chaos."

"Chancellor Adolf Hitler

"In his proclamation of the 1st September, 1933.

"Why Americans Should Read This Book

"The question of Communist propaganda and activities is of im-

mediate importance to the American people in view of the consideration now being given to the question of recognition of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics by the Government of the United States.

"Here is a challenging book. It should be read by every thoughtful citizen because it presents the history of the life-and-death struggle Germany has been waging against Communism. It reveals that the subversive methods and destructive objectives of the Communists in Germany are the same as are employed in the United States by those enemies of civilized nations.

"This book is not a defense of anti-Semitism nor is it a defense of the principles or measures of the Hitler government. The bitter opposition of many to some phases of the Nazi domestic program should not blind us to the reality of the Communist threats.

"The value of this German exposé as an object lesson to other countries has led our committee to place it in the hands of leaders of public opinion throughout the United States.

"The lessons to be gathered from this book, *Communism in Germany*, should lead our citizens to demand more effective measures of defense for our system of government, and our moral and social standards.

Walter L. Cole
 John Ross Delafield
 Ralph M. Easley
 Hamilton Fish, Jr.
 Elon Huntington Hooker
 F. O. Johnson
 Orvel Johnson
 Harry A. Jung
 Samuel McRoberts
 C. G. Norman
 Walter S. Steele
 Archibald E. Stevenson

John B. Trevor

Josiah A. Van Orsdel

"For the American Section of the International Committee to Combat the World Menace of Communism."

Eight years later, on January 14, 1942, a secretarial employee in the office of Hamilton Fish, Jr., Congressman of the United States, was sentenced to prison. The government describes his activities as follows:

"The defendant Hill is an important cog in the most vicious propaganda machine, the most effective propaganda machine that this world has ever seen, so effective and so diabolically clever that it is able to reach into and use the halls of our own Congress as a sounding board for its lies and half truths, by which they are trying to defeat and conquer us just as they defeated and conquered France, Belgium, Holland, Poland, and all those other nations in Europe. . . ." (*Trial Transcript*, p. 850.)

On December 11, 1942, President Roosevelt, in a message to Congress and the country, declared:

"The long known and the long expected has taken place The forces endeavoring to enslave the entire world now are moving toward this hemisphere.

"Never before has there been a greater challenge to life, liberty and civilization."

From Hamilton Fish to George Hill, to Germany's war against the United States, is a clear line of political preparation for the climax of military aggression. Whether they intended it or not, everyone

who helped develop this campaign was working for Hitler.

The United States is at war against the "Antikomintern" Axis, Germany, Italy and Japan, with their satellites. In this life-and-death struggle it finds its most powerful friend, ally and protector in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Up to December 7, 1941, Hitler's agents in the United States made their hysterical "anti-communist" campaign almost entirely upon the argument that American Communists were a "menace" only because they were "agents" of the powerful Soviet Union which was out to "destroy the United States Government." Now that this is exposed as one of Hitler's "huge lies" which he loves so well, a new version is projected. Now the "new line" is, the Soviet Union is O.K. as a military ally, but American Communists are all the more a menace, because "after the war" the United States will then have to lick the Soviet Union, and American Communists will then become the "Fifth Columnists" against their own country. This is the same huge lie in a more insidious form. It is like the "delayed bomb" which Hitler invented while destroying the Spanish Republic. It is aimed to keep our alliance with the Soviet Union from being effective, sow doubt and suspicion among the allies, break up the United Nations—and at the same time continue the old campaign within the country to break up our national unity.

But is it possible that Hitler's secret weapon is the weapon of

truth in so far as his description of the "menace of communism" is concerned?

Unfortunately, many sincere American patriots and convinced anti-Nazis still think as Hitler wants them to think on this question. They are ready to give everything, their property and life itself, to the defeat of Hitler—but they are not ready to give up the "anti-communist" phobia they have accepted from Hitler. With them it has become a fixed idea, a mania, beyond the reach of reason and argument based on facts.

Let us, however, attempt once more to bring such persons to face facts and draw conclusions from them.

Do American Communists themselves, by their own uncompromising and intransigent stand for their particular program, force everyone else to become either "pro" or "anti" communist? No, that is not the case. In fact, we are accused of the opposite; the complaint against the Communists is that we go into all sorts of organizations and help in their worthy objectives, without even speaking of the fact that we are Communists—and this is made the beginning of a new scare about "conspiracy," "boring from within," "secrecy," and so forth. Like most of the "anti-communist" arguments, it is one which works both ways—we are damned if we do, and if we don't we are doubly damned. There is no possible way of reasonable argument with a mind which is set in this groove. It is essentially irrational, it is the victim of a fixed idea, a form of insanity.

Do American Communists themselves help feed Hitler's "anti-communist" crusade by warring against American democracy and its traditions? No, that is not the case. American Communists have long been cooperating with all the democratic forces in our country which will accept such cooperation, and have been actively propagating that American democratic tradition, reviving the study of American history in the light of today's problems. It was out of this revival of American tradition by the Communists that there was born the greatest song of our time, Earl Robinson's *Ballad for Americans*, popularized by the greatest singer of our times, Paul Robeson, which captured our country so completely that the Republican Party used it in its 1940 convention, and the great corporations of Ford Motor Company and International Telephone and Telegraph produced it on their radio programs. But does this make the Communists any more acceptable in the living room of American democracy? On the contrary. If we spoke against American democracy, that would prove Mr. Dies' and Ham Fish's and Hitler's diatribes; when instead we speak most eloquently for American democracy, that is seriously cited as the proof that we are doubly a menace. When anything and everything is taken to prove and double-prove a single pre-conceived idea, is it not the universal lesson of human experience that such "proof" really demonstrates the opposite, that the idea is entirely false?

In defending the Communist

Party against these fixed ideas of the anti-communist crusade I am not interested in establishing for it any record of infallibility. Communists, being human beings, make mistakes like everyone else. And who, in these days of disaster for the world, is not forced, even if it is against his will, to search his own conscience to root out and correct every mistake, even the slightest, which has contributed to bring cataclysm upon mankind? Is there a single American who dares boast of his self-righteousness? Is not the greatest need today for us to find humility and modesty, all of us, nationally?

It would be no aid to victory, however, for the Communists to plead guilty to the Hitler charges, even when they are echoed from the mouth of an American liberal. We are ready to assist these liberals, patiently and painstakingly, to liberate themselves from the Hitler obsessions.

A typical expression of this obsession, the last stronghold of the "Antikomintern," was carried in the *New Republic*, June 22, 1942, in the column of T.R.B. (Kenneth Crawford). His central thought, which has found a thousand other expressions elsewhere, is contained in the following sentence:

"So long as the American Communist Party's disgraceful record during the life of the Russo-German Pact is remembered, the party's existence will remain a source of irritation and danger to the Roosevelt administration and its friends in their on-going struggle for domestic support of the war."

Now what is that "disgraceful record"? We Communists prefer to talk of the problems of the present and future rather than of the past. But the persistence of T.R.B.'s echo of Hitler makes of the past also a problem distorting the present and future. Therefore, we are forced into this discussion against our will. We will face fully and frankly every charge of "disgraceful record" against us. We ask for nothing except an honest acknowledgment of proved facts, and a reasonable judgment on facts, not prejudice.

In August, 1939, the Soviet Union signed a pact of non-aggression with Germany. American newspapers denounced that pact in hysterical terms; American Communists declared that the Soviet Union had no possible alternative, that it also strengthened the position of the United States, and therefore must be supported in its action. That is point one of the "disgraceful record."

Who was right? The sober afterthought in the light of history of practically every responsible statesman and institution in this country now confirms that American newspapers (including the *New Republic*) were wrong in 1939, and the American Communists were right. The evidence is overwhelming. I can take space for only a few citations, but every reader can confirm the matter for himself by mountains of evidence—including the fact that T.R.B. himself, and all his type, refuse to discuss the facts but only recall the prejudice of 1939.

Typical is the sober discussion, issued in 1942 by the Foreign Policy

Association, which certainly is not sympathetic to communism, in the pamphlet *Russia at War* by Vera Micheles Dean. I select her sentences which directly answer T.R.B. (recommending her pamphlet for a complete reading, without agreeing with it entirely):

"Unlike the British, the French, and many Americans, the Soviet leaders never underestimated the military strength and determination of the Nazis. They offered again and again to collaborate with the Western powers in maintaining collective security. . . . But, rightly or wrongly, they did not trust men like Chamberlain. . . . Their fears were confirmed at Munich. . . . From that moment on, the Kremlin placed no further reliance on the good faith of France or Britain. The Soviet leaders were henceforth concerned only with the task of preventing, or at least delaying, a German attack on Russia through Czechoslovakia and Poland. . . . The British and French governments had undergone a change of heart with respect to Germany—although not with respect to the U.S.S.R. . . . Mr. Chamberlain reversed his previous policy, and in April gave guarantees of protection . . . to Russia's border states, Poland, Rumania and Turkey, as well as to Greece. Now many people in Western countries feel that Stalin should have taken these guarantees at face value . . . and come to terms with Britain and France. . . . But we must remember two things. First, Stalin had little reason to trust the British and French. Not only had they, in his opinion, sold Czechoslovakia 'down the river' at Munich, but they had been more or less continuously hostile to the Soviet regime since its

establishment in 1917, and had given many indications that they would welcome its downfall, even at the price of Nazi expansion. The Russians did negotiate with British and French military missions in Moscow during that fateful summer, but the negotiations ended in failure. The chief reason was that Russia demanded the right to acquire bases in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Finland for the purpose of perfecting her defenses against Germany. . . . Second, we must also remember that the Russians did not have a high opinion of the military preparedness of Britain and France—and in this they turned out to be right. . . . It looked as if Russia would have to fight Germany alone. . . . So Stalin . . . signed a non-aggression pact with Germany. . . . It would be difficult to maintain that Stalin had 'betrayed' the Allies by signing his pact with Hitler."

Let us add to this 1942 estimate from a conservative source not sympathetic to the Soviet system the judgment of Winston Churchill himself, uttered in June, 1939, at the time of the negotiations:

"I have from the beginning preferred the Russian proposals to either the British or French alternatives. They are simple, they are logical and they conform to the main groupings of common interests."

Now why, in the light of these judgments which T.R.B. will not publicly dispute, does he find it possible to speak of a "disgraceful record" of the Communist Party in this country because it established

those truths in 1939 and 1940? Was it "disgraceful" to recognize the truth in 1939 but "graceful" to do so only in 1942? Or is T.R.B. still yearning for the "success" which Chamberlain promised but failed to gain? Is he still, in his heart, a partisan of the Munich policy?

We Communists are proud of the fact that we proclaimed the truth in 1939, when the truth if recognized would have averted the disasters which followed.

Perhaps T.R.B. has something else in mind that made a "disgraceful record"? The next step in the record was that the Communist Party opposed United States entry into the war on the grounds that, as it had developed, it was a war for empire between rival imperialisms. One of the most recognized of American publishers, Mr. Henry R. Luce, and the president of the National Industrial Conference Board, Dr. Virgil Jordan, proclaimed it a war for empire in order to advocate entry into it, but that was not considered "disgraceful"; President Roosevelt proclaimed American neutrality and the intention to keep out of it but that was not considered "disgraceful." The Communists combined the judgment that it was an imperialist war, and that we should keep out—and regardless of one's opinion on the merits of each question, it is impossible to make anything "disgraceful" out of the Communist position without striking many other heads than ours, the heads of T.R.B.'s friends, whom he defends.

What was it that distinguished the

position of American Communists at that time, which no other political group shared in any important degree? It was this, that we always insisted that the United States, in its own national interests and that of the freedom-loving world, should combine with the Soviet Union, "to banish the forces of destruction from the earth." On September 11, 1939, ten days after the outbreak of war, the Communist Party addressed an open letter to President Roosevelt and to Congress, which was the foundation for its whole policy during the period T.R.B. finds a "disgraceful record." This entire communication is published in the appendix for the thorough and careful student. I quote from it a few key sentences:

"In this hour of world crisis, when the most horrible catastrophe is descending upon tens of millions of men, women and children in other lands, and is threatening our own country, American thought turns to the question of national unity, to the unity of the great majority of the American people, in protection of the national interests, in furthering the cause of peace, and in finding guarantees for American social and national security. . . . We place before those who are responsible for the welfare of our people and nation the firm solidarity of our party with the hopes, aspirations and desires of the great majority of the American people, and the ardent wish of our party and all its members to work harmoniously with this majority and its elected representatives for the common interest and common welfare. . . . We wish to place on record our firm accord

with the stand of the President of our country against American involvement in the war, or in the rivalries and antagonisms which have led much of Europe into chaos. . . . We pledge our party to cooperation with those who subordinate their personal, partisan or class interests in order to serve the interests of the nation. . . .

"Our country, most powerful in the world, occupies a position . . . similar in most respects to that occupied by the second most powerful nation, the Soviet Union. . . . This common attitude . . . reflects profound common national interests which must, sooner or later, and preferably sooner, result in common policy and action, together with all like-minded peoples and governments, to banish the forces of destruction from the earth, to establish orderly international relations, to secure world peace."

What is "disgraceful" about this position? The only thing that is unfortunate is this—that Hitler's fifth column had succeeded in effectively sabotaging United States foreign policy in this period, prevented it from following any clear line at all, and created an attitude of positive hostility to the Soviet Union that even dominated our entire government for the next period. But the Communist Party is proud of the fact that it never wavered in its considered judgment that United States national interests were inextricably bound up with those of the Soviet Union, and that an alliance must necessarily come, "sooner or later, preferably sooner." And we never wavered in working for this, even when our party leaders were

imprisoned on miserable pretexts and the party itself subjected to Hitler-like attacks.

Consider the position T.R.B. is in when he interprets this consistently understanding and friendly attitude to the Soviet Union by the American Communists as "proving" that we are "an organized Russian nationalist group operating in the United States." Disregarding for the moment the deadly insult this conveys against our most valuable ally in the war, and the fact that it echoes Hitler, let us concentrate attention on the alternative policy which it proposes for the Communist Party if we wished to obtain T.R.B.'s blessings. To "prove" to T.R.B. that we are not "agents of a foreign power," we should, by his logic, have joined in the hysterical denunciations which most American newspapers and commentators indulged in at that time, and of which most Americans are now ashamed. And we should, by the same logic, have more strongly than ever advocated American intervention in the war.

Ask yourself seriously, dear reader, what would have resulted if the American Communists had been as blind and stupid as T.R.B.! With the Soviet Union—the only nation seriously prepared to defeat the military might of Nazi Germany—thrust outside the pale of cooperation as an equal among the democratic powers and small nations, the American Communists should advocate that their own country throw itself into the war against the Axis—and not to speak of the fact that

the war at that time was led by the Chamberlains and Daladiers and was not then an anti-fascist war! History has already proved that even with the Soviet Union fighting the most magnificent battle of all history *on our side*, even now we are not yet assured of victory! What if the American Communists had helped throw the United States into this war *with the Soviet Union still neutral!* It is not American wisdom, but Hitler's stupidity, that directed the course of history otherwise! But imagine the terrible force of T.R.B.'s accusation against the American Communists that we are an agency of the Soviet Union, if we had helped bring about such a disaster to our country. And yet, such a course might conceivably have delayed Hitler's attack against the Soviet Union until he and his Axis partners had *disposed of* the United States!

We American Communists *knew* that the security of the United States depended upon its collaboration with the Soviet Union. We would have been traitors if we, with this knowledge, had helped throw the United States into the war before we were absolutely certain that we would have the Soviet Union actively on our side. But T.R.B. and his kind wish to prove us traitors because we *did not* do that very thing!

Such shoddy thinking, such twisted logic, leads to the very border of Hitler's fifth column, does its work for it, and is equally harmful.

Throughout the period T.R.B. finds "disgraceful," the American

Communists worked energetically and tirelessly to lay the foundations for the United Nations which we were sure would come into existence. Evidence? The biggest single job carried out by the Communist Party in this period was the distribution and sale throughout the country of two million copies of the book by a leading dignitary of the Church of England, Hewlett Johnson, Dean of Canterbury, published under the title *Soviet Power*. This book is today listed as one of the most important books "for winning the war"—so listed by the very persons who attacked the Communists for publishing and distributing it! Mr. T.R.B., did you help distribute the Dean of Canterbury's book, or were you not rather infatuated by the book of the Gestapo agent Jan Valtin, which brought joy to Berlin, or with the Trotskyite tool, "General" Krivitsky, who was dispatched to the United States on agreement between Trotsky and Hess, the special purpose of both "refugees" being to prevent the formation of the United Nations?

When the issue is raised without connection with the American Communists, strangely enough, all the T.R.B.'s admit, point by point, that these positions taken by us from time to time on the biggest political issues were correct ones. But when this correctness is connected with the Communists, they foam at the mouth and curse us as "irritating connivers." Evidently, what they demand is that we Communists, if we are to be accepted as Americans,

must make all the mistakes everyone else makes, make them simultaneously, and not correct ourselves until T.R.B. has already shown the way. But if we were that kind of Communists, no one would worry about us at all, for we would long ago have been politically dead, buried and forgotten.

Is it necessary to go through the long list? We were denounced because we supported the Soviet Union against "poor little Finland." Since Baron Mannerheim's fascist government, openly and without a qualm, merged with Hitler's, and now uses the American planes Herbert Hoover sent him in order to sink American ships, who dares to raise that issue against the American Communists?

We were vilified as "murderers" because we explained and justified the Soviet Union's purges of the fifth-column traitors, the Trotskyites and Bukharinites who had entered the service of Hitler and the Mikado. Who dares to raise this issue against the American Communists today? Why, the very ministers in our churches are calling upon their congregations to "thank God for Stalin and his foresight."

And so, point by point, the case built up against the American Communists, to make them despised and hated pariahs in our society, falls to the ground upon the first honest examination. But the hatred remains, the prejudices persist, the laws thus inspired remain on the statute books, the habits built up under such inspiration remain fixed—all poisoning the daily life of

American democracy and preparing for our nation new mistakes and new disasters; unless as a nation we are big enough and honest enough to wipe out this shameful page in our history and begin anew.

Perhaps the main trouble in many minds today, with regard to the American Communists, is the thought expressed by T.R.B., that we unfairly "bask in reflected Russian glory."

If that is the root of our difficulty it should be easy to remedy. Let T.R.B. and his kind demonstrate that they have really learned the lessons of Munich; let them stop speculating about hypothetical future hostile relations between our country and the Soviet Union; let them show they really understand the basis that exists for profound and lasting friendship between our two countries; let them help America to win its own share of the "glory" now too much monopolized by "Russia"; let us go forward unitedly to victory—then they can easily forget such picayune and sniveling and unworthy fear. The glory of the Soviet Union is something big enough for every American to share equally.

As for the Communist Party of the United States, it is demanding nothing for itself except the common rights of all citizens under our Constitution to participate in the democratic process. We have such profound confidence in the character of the global war, since the participation of the Soviet Union and the United States in it, and the formation of the United Nations, that, with the knowledge that vic-

tory can only result in a peoples' peace with freedom for all nations, we can declare:

1. The Communist Party of the United States has completely subordinated its own ideas as to the best possible social and economic system for our country, which are the ideas of scientific socialism, to the necessity of uniting the entire nation, including the biggest capitalists, for a complete and all-out drive for victory. We give the formal assurance, which is backed up by our deeds, that we will not raise any socialistic proposals for the United States, in any form that can disturb this national unity. To all those still haunted by "the specter of communism," we offer the services of the Communist Party itself to lay this ghost.

2. The Communist Party of the United States foresees that out of victory for the United Nations will come a peace guaranteed by the co-operation of the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain and China, as the chief organizing forces of the post-war world organization. This will make possible the solution of reconstruction problems, with a minimum of social disorder and civil violence, in the various countries most concerned, especially the devastated countries where the problem will be most acute. We declare that our thoughts and deeds will be faithfully and energetically directed to realize this promised perspective for the world, and for our own country, to the utmost possible degree. We offer our cooperation to all like-minded persons and groups.

We have dealt only with a few and the most pressing of the questions involved in the role and position of the Communist Party in the United States. Other aspects of the problem must be dealt with as they

arise in connection with particular problems in the following chapters. And, after all, this whole book is an exposition of the American Communists' attitude to their own country and to the world.