have been somewhat shaken by such testimonies as that of Mr. Max Eastman, Lenin's old friend, who found himself compelled to admit that "instead of being better, Stalinism is worse than fascism, more ruthless, barbarous, unjust, immoral, antidemocratic, unredeemed by any hope or scruple", and that it is "better described as superfascist"; and when we find the same author recognising that "Stalinism is socialism, in the sense of being an inevitable although unforeseen political accompaniment of the nationalisation and collectivisation which he had relied upon as part of his plan for erecting a classless society", his conclusion clearly achieves wider significance.

Mr. Eastman's case is perhaps the most remarkable, yet he is by no means the first or the only sympathetic observer of the Russian experiment to form similar conclusions. Several years earlier Mr. W. H. Chamberlin, who in twelve years in Russia as an American correspondent had seen all his ideals shattered, summed up the conclusions of his studies there and in Germany and Italy in the statement that "Socialism is certain to prove, in the beginning at least, the road NOT to freedom, but to dictatorship and counter-dictatorships, to civil war of the fiercest kind. Socialism achieved and maintained by democratic means seems definitely to belong to the world of utopias." Similarly a British writer, Mr. F. A. Voigt, after many years of close observation of developments in Europe as a foreign correspondent, concludes that "Marxism has led to Fascism and National-Socialism, because, in all essentials, it is Fascism and National Socialism".3 And Dr. Walter Lippmann has arrived at the conviction that

the generation to which we belong is now learning from experience what happens when men retreat from freedom to a

¹ Max Eastman, Stalin's Russia and the Crisis of Socialism, 1940, p. 82.

² W. H. Chamberlin, A False Utopia, 1937, pp. 202-3.

³ F. A. Voigt, Unto Cæsar, 1939, p. 95.