
Infallibility Complex:

The British Left and the Soviet Union, 1930-1950

Greer Rose Gamble
Third Year Undergraduate,
Macquarie University

In his 2003 *Koba the Dread: Laughter and the Twenty Million*, British novelist Martin Amis asks a pertinent question: why. Why ‘everybody knows of Auschwitz and Belsen’ but ‘nobody knows of Vorkuta and Solovetsky’, why ‘everybody knows of Himmler and Eichmann’ but ‘nobody knows of Yezhov and Dzershinsky’; and crucially, why ‘everybody knows of the 6 million of the Holocaust’ but ‘nobody knows of the 6 million of the Terror Famine’.¹ Comparative historians have attempted to remedy this disparity, but the situation remains such that even Robert Conquest, Cold War era chronicler of the Stalinist Terror, replied when asked why he considered Hitlerism to be “worse” than Stalinism, ‘Because I feel it to be so.’² This article intends not to challenge the elevation of the Third Reich over the USSR in historical comparisons of evil, but rather to look at why the Terror has not been granted the same prominence.

I argue that a portion of responsibility for the disparity, as it applies to the Anglosphere at least, can be ascribed to a deliberate campaign of misinformation undertaken by parts of the Western literary Left, including of course the Communist and fellow-travelling but also occasionally the liberal democratic Left, in the 1930s and 40s. We will see that members of these groups took an active interest in the Soviet Union, and through their travels and researches were often among the first Westerners to discover information about state atrocities. Yet many used their influential positions as writers, journalists, and thinkers to deliberately suppress incriminating evidence of Stalin’s crimes, as an examination of their responses to the Ukrainian famine of 1932-4 and the Moscow show trials of 1936-38 will demonstrate.

A look at what became of those on the broader literary Left who rebelled against the Communist line will show that the fellow-travelling and Communist leftists in question did not stop at self-censorship, but actively sought to silence dissenting voices. Why they did so is a question that contemporaries like George Orwell and later historians like Conquest have tried to address; this article acknowledges and builds on the existing historiography, but maintains that further

¹ Martin Amis, *Koba the Dread: Laughter and the Twenty Million* (New York: Vintage, 2003), 257.

² *Ibid.*, 82

research is needed to account for such an extraordinary blunder. Further research will also shed more light on the degree to which their campaign of suppression blighted broader contemporary understandings of the USSR, and on the question of how lasting its effects. Yet the story this article tells, of a deliberate campaign of obfuscation undertaken by the fellow-travelling and Communist Left, is in all probability at least part of the reason that “Holocaust” is a household word in today’s Anglosphere in a way that “Holodomor” is simply not. While focusing on British fellow travellers and Communists as a case study, this article also draws on some figures from the French and American Left to suggest that we are looking not at a singularly British error, but at an international phenomenon.

The Ukrainian famine provides a valuable case study through which we can track the British fellow-travelling literary Left’s unofficial policy of self-delusion in the early 1930s, and look at the ways this delusion was disseminated to the broader public. While the figures are still contested, we can say roughly that five million Ukrainians died in the state-sponsored famine of 1932-34.³ Yet at its height, Irish playwright George Bernard Shaw, who co-founded the London School of Economics and featured prominently in the Fabian society, visited the USSR and in an open letter to the *Manchester Guardian* declared its citizens to be “the best fed in Europe.”⁴ Shaw could plead ignorance on the grounds of the Potemkin-style tour he was given, but the facts were available at home. Eyewitness accounts were published in the *Manchester Guardian*,⁵ and British journalists like Malcolm Muggeridge and Gareth Jones had reported extensively on their travels to famine-stricken areas in high-circulation papers.⁶ The famine was so widely known of that both the House of Lords and the House of Representatives passed famine-related resolutions.⁷ Yet these garnered little attention or support, and were often directly ignored by those with Soviet sympathies.

Although Soviet physicians were prohibited from ascribing death to famine, and the USSR’s adoption of the “biological yield method” (where productivity is measured on estimated rather than actual output) obscured the statistics,⁸ the actions of fellow-travelling British journalists attest to their knowledge of the famine. When Gareth Jones attempted to publicize details of the famine, a league of Communist and fellow-travelling British and American journalists publicly denounced his version of events, in a campaign spearheaded by Walter Duranty of the *New York Times*, who won the 1932 Pulitzer for journalism.⁹ These journalists did not act out of ignorance; however, after publicly reporting on sound conditions after his 1933 visit to the USSR, Duranty described to his peers the horror he had witnessed, and according to his colleague Eugene Lyons, estimated a high death toll.¹⁰ Lyons, another member of the informal league to discredit Jones, later referred to ‘the whole shabby episode of our failure to report honestly on the gruesome Russian famine.’¹¹ Lyons and others did indeed know the truth about the famine and not only failed to report it, but

3 Dana G. Dalrymple, “The Soviet Famine of 1932-4,” *Soviet Studies* 15 (1964): 250.

4 Robert Conquest, *The Great Terror* (London: Macmillan, 1968), 504.

5 See A Citizen of Soviet Russia, “Famine in the Northern Caucasus,” *Manchester Guardian*, 28 August 1933.

6 See Malcolm Muggeridge, “The Soviet’s War on the Peasants,” *Fortnightly Review*, May 1933; Gareth Jones, “Russia in Grip of Famine,” *The Morning Post*, 3 March 1933; Gareth Jones, “Famine Rules Russia,” *The London Evening Standard*, 31 March 1933.

7 Dalrymple, “Soviet Famine,” 256.

8 *Ibid.*, 267-283.

9 *Ibid.*, 280; see Walter Duranty, “Russians Hungry but Not Starving,” *New York Times*, 31 March 1933.

10 Dalrymple, “Soviet Famine,” 281.

11 Eugene Lyons, *Assignment in Utopia* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1937), 572.

also actively deceived the public by discrediting Jones' report.¹² Simultaneously, they deceived themselves. Hungarian ex-Communist Arthur Koestler described witnessing the famine first-hand and accepting official explanations he knew even at the time to be false.¹³ It is clear that for these Communist and fellow-travelling men of letters, any illusions they held about the famine were self-imposed. Unfortunately, as would soon also happen in the Moscow trials, these illusions were then imposed onto their readers.

The British literary figure Stephen Spender recalled one of his former comrades saying of the Moscow trials, 'Whether or not [proof of the defendants' innocence] exists, it is bourgeois propaganda to maintain so.'¹⁴ The proof did exist, and was categorically denied throughout the Purge era by the Communist and fellow-travelling Left, who as we will see went to great lengths to obfuscate it in their writings. As early as 1937, the esteemed British medical journal *Lancet* suspected the use of torture in the Moscow trials and spoke of "the impulse of submission" which had prompted the confessions.¹⁵ The Commission of Inquiry into the Charges Against Leon Trotsky, headed by eminent American philosopher John Dewey, published its findings that the trials were complete frame-ups in 1937.¹⁶ Orthodox members of the British Labor Party like Frederick Alder published pamphlets exposing the lies behind the trials, as did the widely read *Manchester Guardian*.¹⁷ One of the defendants, Victor Serge, was accused of complicity in the Kirov murder even though he was arrested two years prior to its occurrence.¹⁸ Another defendant was indicted for a meeting in a Copenhagen hotel that did not in fact exist, while a landing at a Norwegian airfield was described in a month in which no landings there had occurred.¹⁹ In short, the facts about the trials were readily available to even the least judicious observers.

The hold of Stalin's regime on the fellow-travelling literary Left, however, rendered these facts indigestible. Prominent British socialists Sidney and Beatrice Webb, in their self-proclaimed 'detached and philosophic interpretation [of the trials]' concluded, 'The Soviet government must have had strong grounds for the action which has involved such unwelcome consequences.'²⁰ Professor Harold Laski, who later served as Chairman of the British Labor Party, similarly observed that he 'did not observe much difference between the general character of a trial in Russia and in this country.'²¹ There are many examples of other influential British intellectuals, including Sir John Maynard and Sir Bernard Pares, expressing the same attitudes.²² Even the *New Statesman*, organ of the non-aligned Left, editorialized that 'few would maintain that any or all [of the defendants]

12 Ronald Radosh, "The Mendacity of Walter Duranty," *The New Criterion* 30 (2012): 87-90; Robert P. Hager, "'Progressive' Obscurantists and Immature 'Anti-Fascists': Stalin's American Intellectual Followers," *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics* 16 (2000): 126.

13 Arthur Koestler, "The Initiates," in *The God That Failed: Six Studies in Communism*, ed. Richard Crossman (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1950), 68.

14 Stephen Spender, "Worshippers From Afar," *God That Failed*, 239.

15 "The Russian Trials," *The Lancet* 229 (1937): 331.

16 Alan Ward, "Memories of the Dewey Commission: Forty Years Later," *The Antioch Review* 35 (1977): 439.

17 Conquest, *Terror*, 503.

18 *Ibid.*, 501.

19 *Ibid.*, 501.

20 *Ibid.*, 506.

21 *Ibid.*, 506.

22 *Ibid.*, 506-507.

were completely innocent.²³ Spender's comrade Chalmers summed up the attitude of the fellow-travelling Left when he said, 'There are so many of those trials, I have given up thinking of them long ago.'²⁴ Stalin, when asked if he was worried about the Western response to the Zinoviev trial replied, 'Never mind, they'll swallow it.'²⁵ Many did, despite the evidence. Yet for all of the doctrinaires who did "swallow" the Communist Party (CP) version of events, there were many on the broader Left who rejected them.

A look at how anti-Stalinist dissidents were treated by the fellow-travelling literary Left of Britain helps to explain the influence that fellow travellers wielded and the discourse. It was very difficult, in the period between 1930 and 1950, to get any work critical of the USSR published in the progressive British press. The Leftist Jonathan Cape and CP-aligned Victor Gollancz both refused to publish George Orwell's *Animal Farm* (1945), a satire on the Russian revolution that was highly critical of Stalin, on political grounds.²⁶ Gollancz had also rejected the manuscript of *Homage to Catalonia* (1938) on the grounds that it detailed Republican atrocities in the Spanish Civil War.²⁷ For the same reason *The New Statesman* rejected Orwell's dispatches from Spain, while the French publisher lined up to translate *Animal Farm* pulled out in 1946 citing political differences.²⁸ When Orwell did get published, his British fellow-travelling contemporaries tended to pronounce his works failures. Kingsley Martin, former editor of the *New Statesman*, in 1945 called *Animal Farm* 'historically false and neglectful of the complex truth about the USSR,'²⁹ while James Walsh urged his Marxist peers to make 'the extra push now to get rid of it [1984] altogether.'³⁰ Samuel Sillen, editor of the Communist journal *Masses and Mainstream*, in his indictment of Orwell's political stance went so far as to compare him to the pro-fascist Ezra Pound,³¹ whom Orwell had criticized at length.³² More serious critics like Isaac Deutscher, Trotsky's biographer, said of *1984* (1949), 'It has only increased the waves of panic and hate that run through the world and obfuscate innocent minds.'³³ A letter to the *Manchester Guardian* on the publication of *1984* penned by leading British Communist R. Palme Dutt accused Orwell of ignorance about the realities of Communism and claimed the book represented only the dangers 'of present-day Western monopoly capitalism.'³⁴ Yet dissidents from totalitarian regimes such as Vaclav Havel, Czeslaw Milosz, Adam Michnik and Leszek Kolakowski have all paid tribute to *Animal Farm* and *1984*.³⁵ Milosz stated, 'Even those who know Orwell only by hearsay are amazed that a writer who never lived in Russia should have so

23 *Ibid.*, 503.

24 Spender, "Worshippers," 238.

25 Conquest, *Terror*, 500.

26 Christopher Hitchens, *Arguably* (Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 2011), 232.

27 Bill Alexander, "George Orwell and Spain," in *Inside the Myth: Orwell, Views from the Left*, ed. Christopher Norris (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1984), 95.

28 George Orwell, "Letter to Arthur Koestler," in *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell*, ed. Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus, vol. IV (London: Secker & Warburg, 1968), 77.

29 Kingsley Martin, "Review of *Animal Farm*," *New Statesman and Nation*, 8 September 1945; reprinted in *George Orwell: The Critical Heritage*, ed. Jeffrey Meyers (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975), 199.

30 James Walsh, "Review of *1984*," *Marxist Quarterly* 3 (1956): 28.

31 Samuel Sillen, "Review of *1984*," *Critical Heritage*, 275.

32 George Orwell, "The Question of the Pound Award," *CEJL*, 490.

33 Quoted in Walsh, "Review," 293.

34 *Ibid.*, 287.

35 Christopher Hitchens, *Why Orwell Matters* (New York: Basic Books, 2002), 57.

keen a perception into its life.³⁶ Thus while intellectuals with direct experience of Stalinist regimes were applauding Orwell's realism, British Communists and fellow travellers who had not lived in the USSR were accusing him of historical fraudulence. To Communist and fellow-travelling Britons, direct experience did not necessarily command respect.

Any writer, even a former Soviet citizen, who rebelled against the Stalinist line could count on a chilly reception from the fellow-travelling Left. Soviet defector Victor Kravchenko's *I Chose Freedom* (1946) was greeted with a vicious smear campaign,³⁷ while Koestler's *Darkness at Noon* (1940), a fictionalization of the Moscow trials, was combated by the Communist press throughout Western Europe with a combination of silence, invective and censorship.³⁸ 'It is typical of Comrade Spender's bourgeois mentality that he invents stories of this kind,' was the response Spender got from his CP branch when he recounted the true story of a former gulag inmate whose acquaintance he had made.³⁹ Soviet exile Eugene Zamyatin's dystopic *We* (1921) had been similarly dismissed on the grounds of Zamyatin's being a "petit-bourgeois writer".⁴⁰ French thinker Maurice Merleau-Ponty articulated the fellow-travelling attitude towards these works well when he said of *Darkness at Noon*, 'Any criticism of Communism. . . really aims at the very existence of the USSR and must be considered as an act of war.'⁴¹ We have seen that the fellow-travelling British Left's pro-Stalinist campaign did not stop with the spreading of misinformation about the Ukrainian famine and the Purges, but extended to campaigns of smearing and silencing against dissenting voices.

There are many possible explanations for why fellow-travelling Britons undertook this campaign. For example, opposition to fascism and imperialism, which were undoubtedly powerful forces uniting broad sections of the Left behind Stalin's Soviet Union in the 1930s particularly; he was after all the only European leader prepared to intervene against the fascists in Spain. Spender recalled that one of the reasons he was attracted to the CP was that all the British officials and businessmen he knew seemed to support Franco.⁴² Yet after the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact in August 1939, support for Stalin remained, and a pro-German attitude began to surface in British Communist organs. Contemporary issues of the *Daily Worker* attest to this. *The Daily Worker*, which had attacked Nazism as a global menace throughout the 1930s, editorialized on February 1st 1940 that 'Hitler once again repeated his claim that the war had been thrust on him by Britain. Against this historical fact there is no reply.'⁴³ The April 9 issue made no mention of Hitler's invasion of Norway on that day, although the April 10 issue did mention the 'open violation by Britain and France of Norwegian neutrality when they laid their mines,' and warned against 'the immediate possibility of British and French attempts to invade [Sweden, Norway, and Holland].'⁴⁴ It was not until later in the issue that the Nazi invasion of Norway was even mentioned, in passing and making clear, as Gollancz noted, that the paper was 'overjoyed at the superior position in which

36 Czesław Miłosz, *The Captive Mind*, trans. Jane Zielonko (London: Secker & Warburg, 1953), 42.

37 Conquest, *Terror*, 511-512.

38 Martine Poulain, "A Cold War Bestseller: The Reaction to Arthur Koestler's *Darkness at Noon* in France from 1945 to 1950," *Libraries & Culture* 36 (2001): 176.

39 Spender, "Worshippers," 263.

40 Walsh, "Review," 28.

41 Quoted in Poulain, "Bestseller," 179.

42 Spender, "Worshippers," 246.

43 Quoted in Victor Gollancz, *The Betrayal of the Left*, ed. Victor Gollancz (London: Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1941), 27.

44 *Ibid.*, 31.

Hitler-fascism has placed itself.⁴⁵ The earlier pro-war, anti-Nazi position of the USSR had to be forcibly forgotten. Harry Pollitt, secretary of the British CP, had written a pamphlet early in 1939 defending the Party's then-current position. In September the pamphlet was withdrawn and Pollitt coerced into resigning his secretaryship and recanting his earlier statements.⁴⁶ Similarly so with the anti-imperialism formerly espoused by the CP: consider Eric Hobsbawm and Raymond Williams' 1940 pamphlet defending the USSR's invasion of Finland.⁴⁷ While the Trotskyist Left demanded Moroccan independence during the Spanish Civil War, Stalin and the British CP opposed this.⁴⁸ Spender was thus correct when he wrote, 'The Communist, having joined the Party, has to castrate himself of the reasons which have made him one.'⁴⁹ While the USSR's anti-fascism and anti-imperialism may have been simple *realpolitik*— Soviet ambassador Alexei Merekalov did say that ideological differences were unimportant to Russian foreign policy⁵⁰— it was likely more painful for rank-and-file Communists and fellow travellers to recant their convictions. But recant they did, demonstrating that anti-imperialism and anti-fascism were not as important to British Communists as may have been imagined, and other reasons for their behavior in the 30s and 40s must be explored.

Conquest suggests that the British CP and fellow travellers' blindness to the crimes of the USSR can be explained by their inability to comprehend totalitarianism, having had no direct experience of it. Of the Webbs' attitude to the Purges he posits, 'It doubtless never occurred to the Webbs, brought up in Britain, that official documents do not necessarily bear much relation to fact.'⁵¹ John Middleton Murry, founder of *The Adelphi*, wrote in 1946 that progressive-minded peoples' toadying to Russia 'is possible only because those who practice it have no actual experience of totalitarianism and are incapable of an imaginative one.'⁵² The attempt to understand the irrationality of a totalitarian dictatorship using a rational framework can be seen at work in a journalist like Duranty, who after observing Pyatkov's trial argued that as "the brains of heavy industry", Pyatkov was so indispensable that he would not have been killed unless he really was guilty.⁵³ Yet this logic could of course be applied to every Old Bolshevik. Like Chamberlain, of whom 'the true criticism is that he could not really imagine a man like Hitler or a party like the Nazis,'⁵⁴ the fellow-travelling and Communist Left failed to make the imaginative leap. However, this is not an "excuse", for many Leftist Britons, such as Orwell, *did* make the leap, proving its possibility; a further reason is thus required to explain the fellow travellers' behavior.

In his 1945 essay "Notes on Nationalism",⁵⁵ Orwell noted a phenomenon he believed to be peculiar to his times, in which the absence, or reduced appeal, of traditional authorities was compensated for by loyalty transference. The Enlightenment and the Scientific Revolution had undermined

45 *Ibid.*, 31.

46 *Ibid.*, viii.

47 Hitchens, *Why Orwell Matters*, 47.

48 Christopher Hitchens, "Introduction," in *Orwell in Spain*, ed. P. H. Davison (London: Penguin, 2001), xv.

49 Spender, "Worshippers," 272.

50 E. H. Carr, "From Munich to Moscow," *Soviet Studies* 1 (1949): 3-17.

51 Conquest, *Terror*, 509.

52 John Middleton Murry, "Review of *Critical Essays*," *Critical Heritage*, 227.

53 Conquest, *Terror*, 504.

54 Robert Conquest, *Common Sense About Russia* (London: Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1960), 215.

55 George Orwell, "Notes on Nationalism," in *Decline of the English Murder and Other Essays*, ed. George Orwell (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1965).

religious faith, and WWI had destroyed for many young Britons their faith in the authority of the state.⁵⁶ The USSR, with its claims to infallibility, may have filled this vacuum for British Leftists, just as fascism filled the same vacuum for many Right-wing Europeans, including Britons. ‘In societies such as ours,’ writes Orwell, ‘it is unusual for anyone described as an intellectual to feel a very deep attachment to his own country,’ but ‘he still feels a need for a Fatherland’ and ‘having found it, he can wallow unrestrainedly in exactly those emotions from which he believes he has emancipated himself.’⁵⁷ Thus the irrationalities of religious devotion remained but were simply redirected, so that it became possible for Tory MPs to celebrate the news that Italian forces in the pay of Franco had bombed British ships,⁵⁸ or for “anti-fascist” publications like the *Daily Worker* to celebrate Nazi victories. It is possible that extreme Left and extreme Right ideologies were able to circumvent reason— and even morality— by virtue of their reliance on faith and emotion. Even Richard Shorten, who challenges this thesis, nevertheless concedes, ‘That the ideological passions behind [Hitlerism and Stalinism] constituted religious phenomena is more than ungrounded intuition.’⁵⁹ The French Communist Andre Gide described his conversion to Communism as ‘like a faith . . . the plan of the Soviet Union seems to me to point to salvation.’⁶⁰ When Spender saw crowds of British CP members at a meeting for Spanish solidarity it made him ‘think of the crowds described in the New Testament.’⁶¹ Bertrand Russell, after his visit to post-Revolutionary Russia, compared the ferocity with which the dogma of Communism was held by its acolytes with Christianity, and predicted that in time the former would do as much harm as the latter.⁶² Ideology functioned as a faith, not just for the Bolsheviks Russell describes but as well for their international followers. It was as another French philosopher Raymond Aron described it: ‘a systematic doctrine which promised salvation by means of conversion.’⁶³ There were many contributive factors in the willful blindness and deliberate campaign of misinformation spearheaded by Communist and fellow-travelling Britons in the 30s and 40s. Yet it is difficult to explain the erratic posture changing around the Hitler-Stalin Pact, the willful ignorance of the Ukrainian famine, the uncritical acceptance of the Moscow trials, and the vitriol that was poured on Leftist dissidents, without reference to the frameworks of faith and religion.

The fellow travellers and Communists discussed in this article were influential journalists and authors, and as such presided over British public opinion to a degree unparalleled by other extreme political movements of the time, like Oswald Mosley’s Blackshirts. Gide’s statement concerning his French readers, ‘I am responsible for those at home whom my opinion might lead astray,’⁶⁴ is equally applicable to influential British writers like the Webbs. Perhaps if they had reported more truthfully, “Yezhov” might be as much a household term as “Eichmann” is today. Just as the Catholic Church has in recent years faced the consequences of its failure to condemn Nazism,⁶⁵ so ‘those who “swallowed” the trials can hardly be acquitted of a certain degree of complicity in

56 See Dan Todman, *The Great War: Myth and Memory* (London: Hambledon Continuum, 2005).

57 Orwell, “Notes on Nationalism,” 164.

58 George Orwell, “Burnham’s View of the Contemporary World Struggle,” *CEJL*, 321.

59 Richard Shorten, “The Enlightenment, Communism and Political Religion: Reflections on a Misleading Trajectory,” *Journal of Political Ideologies* 8.1 (2003): 13.

60 Andre Gide, “Worshippers from Afar,” *The God That Failed*, 176.

61 Spender, “Worshippers,” 245.

62 Bertrand Russell, *The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1920), 16.

63 Quoted in Shorten, “The Enlightenment,” 14-15.

64 Gide, “Worshippers,” 180.

65 See Kevin P. Spicer, *Hitler’s Priests: Catholic Clergy and National Socialism* (Illionois: Illionois University Press, 2008).

the continuation and exacerbation of the torture and execution of innocent men.⁶⁶ International Communists and fellow travellers could and often did make a difference to Soviet actions. Victor Serge was released after three years of imprisonment owing to the pressure of international Leftist groups on Stalin.⁶⁷ Similarly, a letter from French CP members to the Spanish government during its liquidation of the Worker's Party of Marxist Unification (POUM), a Left Opposition party, was effective in stopping any further purging of its upper ranks.⁶⁸

It is thus possible that Communist and fellow travelling Britons could have made a difference, if they had put as much energy into exposing events such as the Moscow trials and the Holodomor as they did into covering them up, and silencing others who sought to bring them to British attention. Yet due to a misguided belief in the USSR as an anti-imperialist and anti-fascist force, or an inability to comprehend totalitarianism, or simply the longing for an infallible leadership, they did not. The silence, censorship, and lies of the fellow-travelling and Communist British Left are of course not the only reasons why the 5 million of the Terror Famine, or the 13-15 million of Stalin's victims more generally,⁶⁹ are not as widely recognized and mourned in the West as are the 6 million of the Holocaust. Yet if ordinary German citizens, or "bystanders", are condemned by history for their failure to see and failure to act in the face of Hitlerism, then so must the fellow travellers of the 1930s and 40s be condemned for their failure to do the same in the face of Stalinism.

66 Conquest, *Terror*, 501.

67 *Ibid.*, 500.

68 Robert Conquest, *The Great Terror: A Reassessment* (London: Hutchinson, 1990), 410-411.

69 This is taken from Conquest's revised figures in *The Great Terror: A Reassessment*, 484-489
