

In H G Wells interviewed Joseph Stalin in Moscow. The fallout from the meeting led to a battle between three intellectual powerhouses - Shaw, Keynes and Wells - each of whom argued for their own vision of socialism in the UK.

He was the son of a poor cobbler in the provincial Georgian town of Gori in the Caucasus , then an imperial Russian colony. The drunken father savagely beat his son. Speaking only Georgian at home, Joseph learned Russian—which he always spoke with a guttural Georgian accent—while attending the church school at Gori . The mother, a devout washerwoman, had dreamed of her son becoming a priest, but Joseph Dzhugashvili was more ruffianly than clerical in appearance and outlook. He was short, stocky, black-haired, fierce-eyed, with one arm longer than the other, his swarthy face scarred by smallpox contracted in infancy. Physically strong and endowed with prodigious willpower, he early learned to disguise his true feelings and to bide his time; in accordance with the Caucasian blood-feud tradition, he was implacable in plotting long-term revenge against those who offended him. In December , Dzhugashvili became, briefly, a clerk in the Tiflis Observatory, the only paid employment that he is recorded as having taken outside politics; there is no record of his ever having done manual labour. In he joined the political underground, fomenting labour demonstrations and strikes in the main industrial centres of the Caucasus, but his excessive zeal in pushing duped workers into bloody clashes with the police antagonized his fellow conspirators. After the Social Democrats Marxist revolutionaries of the Russian Empire had split into their two competing wings—Menshevik and Bolshevik—in , Dzhugashvili joined the second, more militant, of these factions and became a disciple of its leader, Lenin. Between April and March , Dzhugashvili was seven times arrested for revolutionary activity, undergoing repeated imprisonment and exile. The mildness of the sentences and the ease with which the young conspirator effected his frequent escapes lend colour to the unproved speculation that Dzhugashvili was for a time an agent provocateur in the pay of the imperial political police. Rise to power Dzhugashvili made slow progress in the party hierarchy. He attended three policy-making conclaves of the Russian Social Democrats—in Tammerfors now Tampere , Finland; , Stockholm , and London—without making much impression. His first big political promotion came in February January, Old Style , when Lenin—now in emigration—co-opted him to serve on the first Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party, which had finally broken with the other Social Democrats. In about Stalin had married a pious Georgian girl, Ekaterina Svanidze. She died some three years later and left a son, Jacob, whom his father treated with contempt , calling him a weakling after an unsuccessful suicide attempt in the late s; when Jacob was taken prisoner by the Germans during World War II , Stalin refused a German offer to exchange his son. Besides heading the secretariat, he was also member of the powerful Politburo and of many other interlocking and overlapping committees—an arch-bureaucrat engaged in quietly outmaneuvering brilliant rivals, including Trotsky and Grigory Zinovyev , who despised such mundane organizational work. Because the pockmarked Georgian was so obviously unintellectual, they thought him unintelligent—a gross error, and one literally fatal in their case. Vladimir Ilich Lenin, Archpriest of Leninism , Stalin also promoted his own cult in the following year by having the city of Tsaritsyn renamed Stalingrad now Volgograd. Soon afterward Stalin joined with the rightist leaders Nikolay Bukharin and Aleksey Rykov in an alliance directed against his former co-triumvirs. His most-powerful rivals were all dismissed, Bukharin and Rykov soon following Zinovyev and Kamenev into disgrace and political limbo pending execution. Stalin expelled Trotsky from the Soviet Union in and had him assassinated in Mexico in This was, in effect, a new Russian revolution more devastating in its effects than those of Resisting desperately, the reluctant muzhiks were attacked by troops and OGPU political police units. Uncooperative peasants , termed kulaks , were arrested en masse, being shot, exiled, or absorbed into the rapidly expanding network of Stalinist concentration camps and worked to death under atrocious conditions. Collectivization also caused a great famine in Ukraine. Yet Stalin continued to export the grain stocks that a less cruel leader would have rushed to the famine-stricken areas. Some 10 million peasants may have perished through his policies during these years. Crash industrialization was less disastrous in its effects, but it, too, numbered its grandiose failures, to which Stalin responded by arraigning industrial managers in a

succession of show trials. Yet Stalin was successful in rapidly industrializing a backward country—as was widely acknowledged by enthusiastic contemporary foreign witnesses, including Adolf Hitler and such well-known writers as H. Wells and George Bernard Shaw. They had two children. The son, Vasily, perished as an alcoholic after rising to unmerited high rank in the Soviet Air Force. The great purges In late —just when the worst excesses of Stalinism seemed to have spent themselves—the Secretary General launched a new campaign of political terror against the very Communist Party members who had brought him to power; his pretext was the assassination, in Leningrad on December 1, of his leading colleague and potential rival, Sergey Kirov. Stalin used the show trial of leading Communists as a means for expanding the new terror. In August , Zinovyev and Kamenev were paraded in court to repeat fabricated confessions, sentenced to death, and shot; two more major trials followed, in January and March In June , Marshal Mikhail Tukhachevsky , at the time the most influential military personality, and other leading generals were reported as court-martialed on charges of treason and executed. Such were the main publicly acknowledged persecutions that empowered Stalin to tame the Soviet Communist Party and the Soviet elite as a whole. Other victims included foreign Communists on Soviet territory and members of the very political police organization, now called the NKVD. All other sections of the Soviet elite—the arts, the academic world, the legal and diplomatic professions—also lost a high proportion of victims, as did the population at large, to a semi-haphazard, galloping persecution that fed on extorted denunciations and confessions. These implicated even more victims until Stalin himself reduced the terror, though he never abandoned it. His main motive was, presumably, to maximize his personal power. In August , after first attempting to form an anti-Hitler alliance with the Western powers, he concluded a pact with Hitler , which encouraged the German dictator to attack Poland and begin World War II. Anxious to strengthen his western frontiers while his new but palpably treacherous German ally was still engaged in the West, Stalin annexed eastern Poland , Estonia , Latvia , Lithuania , and parts of Romania ; he also attacked Finland and extorted territorial concessions. Khrushchev claimed that Stalin was shocked into temporary inactivity by the onslaught, but, if so, he soon rallied and appointed himself supreme commander in chief. When the Germans menaced Moscow in the winter of , he remained in the threatened capital, helping to organize a great counter-offensive. As war leader, Stalin maintained close personal control over the Soviet battlefronts, military reserves, and war economy. At first over-inclined to intervene with inept telephoned instructions, as Hitler did, the Soviet generalissimo gradually learned to delegate military decisions. In June , German armoured divisions roll deep into the Soviet Union, but by winter they find their supply lines stretched thin and the Soviets determined to fight. From The Second World War: Battle of StalingradIn the Battle of Stalingrad —43 , the advancing Germans were finally stopped by the Red Army in desperate house-to-house fighting. A formidable negotiator, he outwitted these foreign statesmen; his superior skill has been acclaimed by Anthony Eden , then British foreign secretary. Left to right Soviet leader Joseph Stalin, U. Potsdam ConferenceOverview of the Potsdam Conference. He thus increased the number of his subjects by about a hundred million. But in the defection of Titoist Yugoslavia from the Soviet camp struck a severe blow to world Communism as a Stalin-dominated monolith. The death of Joseph Stalin, At home, the primacy of Marxist ideology was harshly reasserted. Hopes for domestic relaxation, widely aroused in the Soviet Union during the war, were thus sadly disappointed. Increasingly suspicious and paranoid in his later years, Stalin ordered the arrest, announced in January , of certain—“mostly Jewish—” Kremlin doctors on charges of medically murdering various Soviet leaders, including Zhdanov. Legacy A politician to the marrow of his bones, Stalin had little private or family life, finding his main relaxation in impromptu buffet suppers, to which he would invite high party officials, generals, visiting foreign potentates, and the like. Drinking little himself on these occasions, the dictator would encourage excessive indulgence in others, thus revealing weak points that he could exploit. Stalin had a keen, ironical sense of humour, usually devoted to deflating his guests rather than to amusing them. Library of Congress, Washington, D. Against these formidable achievements must be set one major disadvantage. Though a high industrial output was indeed achieved under Stalin, very little of it ever became available to the ordinary Soviet citizen in the form of consumer goods or amenities of life. A considerable proportion of the national wealth—a proportion wholly unparalleled in the history of any peacetime capitalist country—was appropriated by the state to cover

military expenditure, the police apparatus, and further industrialization. It is also arguable that a comparable degree of industrialization would have come about in any case—and surely by means less savage—under almost any conceivable regime that might have evolved as an alternative to Stalinism. Moreover, the process of intensive urbanization, as instituted by Stalin, continued after his death in what still remained a population more predominantly rural than that of any other major industrial country. But the element of total personal dictatorship did not survive Stalin in its most extreme form. Not only did his methods crush initiative among Soviet administrators, physically destroying many, but they also left a legacy of remembered fear so extreme as to render continuing post-Stalin restrictions tolerable to the population; the people would have more bitterly resented—might even, perhaps, have rejected—such rigours, had it not been for their vivid recollection of repressions immeasurably harsher. Stalin has arguably made a greater impact on the lives of more individuals than any other figure in history. But the evaluation of his overall achievement still remains, decades after his death, a highly controversial matter. Historians have not yet reached any definitive consensus on the worth of his accomplishments, and it is unlikely that they ever will. To the American scholar George F. Tucker, an American specialist on Soviet affairs, has described Stalin as a 20th-century Ivan the Terrible. To the British historian E. Carr, the Georgian dictator appears as a ruthless, vigorous figure, but one lacking in originality—a comparative nonentity thrust into greatness by the inexorable march of the great revolution that he found himself leading. To such views may be added the suggestion that Stalin was anything but a plodding mediocrity, being rather a man of superlative, all-transcending talent. His special brilliance was, however, narrowly specialized and confined within the single crucial area of creative political manipulation, where he remains unsurpassed. Stalin was the first to recognize the potential of bureaucratic power, while the other Bolshevik leaders still feared their revolution being betrayed by a military man.

Chapter 2 : Flowers and Stalin: H.G. Wells in Russia - Russia Beyond

H.G. Wells interviewed Stalin in Moscow in for the magazine The New Statesman. Wells was an avowed socialist and one of the left's most influential authors. Wells was an avowed socialist and one of the left's most influential authors.

In fact, a significant number of English and west European workers moved to the USSR to work since there was a labor shortage. American firms went there as well. Whatever the economists were talking about, the US had just started to change to an incredibly centralized, semi-planned economy based on military spending as well as things like the NSF. The US is still like this, the military budget is over half a trillion a year, and the brass has been publicly begging Congress for decades now to not make so useless tanks and such. Khrushchev made a lot of changes, and problems began cropping up bread shortages, less capital spending etc. Also the price argument is tautological and not falsifiable. Something is valuable because something is valuable. Is all the equipment buys, and wasted electricity and so forth a rational allocation of capital? How are you defining "great"? The importance of the price system for efficient resource allocation is pretty much accepted by all mainstream economists to the point of being taught in introductory economics textbooks. BugBrother on Apr 20, I got a bit of cognitive dissonance here. But I guess it connects, in a way. So I can believe there was a lack of workers and lots of jobs in Soviet From a strict economic perspective, if not humanitarian, I guess that could be called "great"? Edited for spelling correction, the contextualization at the end, and the note about how overt signs of association affect self-appropriation of names As Malcolm Muggeridge wrote, initially a supporter of the Soviets until he witnessed what their policies actually meant as a correspondent for the Guardian in Moscow: Are you attempting to imply that because Stalin presided over a terrible famine his political ideals must be flawed? Churchill and friends presided over the Bengal famine of the s. Six million people died in a famine during which food was exported out of Bengal to aid the British war effort. Do you think any of this counts against capitalism or do you have any reasons why we should disregard these anecdotes but count the Ukrainian famine against socialism? The same cannot be said of communism. A common notion of it is the "increase shareholder value" version, where the only thing that matters to executives is profit. You can see that in the company stores of yore, and the eternal reemergence of monopolies and oligopolies that will treat treat both their workers and their customers exactly as poorly as they can get away with. There are other approaches to capitalism, of course. So according to you, the entire world lived under a system that required the oppression of others prior to 10, years ago, when everyone lived in migrating hunter-gatherer bands where all wealth was shared. This was a system that forced people to starve, according to you. Also, how is communism like how people lived prior to 10, years ago? The whole point is there is no surplus production. Also, how exactly would one band of hunter gatherers continually oppress another band of hunter gatherers over a period of time? Establish a hierarchy based on power and violence, and extort taxes. Once there is a hierarchy with taxes and such you no longer have a migratory hunter-gatherer band. I am talking about what happened before that. Deficit creates the need for structuring. Do you have something specific to point to? My criticism is directed at Wells in this case.

Chapter 3 : H. G. Wells's™ interview with Stalin () | Hacker News

Wells was very observant during his trip, and his memoir marvels at how people continued to live, despite the strain and difficulties of post-war Soviet life.

He terrified the Soviet Union with campaign after campaign of political purges, he moved whole populations into Siberia and he arguably killed more people than Hitler. But it took decades for the scope of his crimes to get out, mostly because, unlike Hitler, Stalin stuck to killing his own people. In early s, however, Stalin was considered by many to be the leader of the future. That period was, of course, the nadir of the Great Depression. Capitalism seemed to be coming apart at the seams. The USSR promised a new society ruled not by the oligarchs of Wall Street but by the people - a society where everyone was equal. His first novel, *The Time Machine*, is essentially an allegory for class struggle after all. The interview between the two is fascinating. Wells opens the piece by stating that he speaks for the common people. While that point is debatable -- Stalin calls him out on that assertion -- Wells does speak in a manner that is readily understandable. Stalin, in contrast, speaks in fluent Politburo. The blandness of his speech, choked with Communist boilerplate, seems designed to make the listener tune out. But then he drops little bon mots into his monologues that hint at the violence he has unleashed on his country. Take this line for instance: Revolution, the substitution of one social system for another, has always been a struggle, a painful and a cruel struggle, a life-and-death struggle. Especially when you consider that at the time of this interview, Stalin was just starting to launch his first wave of political purges and he was plotting to assassinate his main political rival Sergei Kirov. Stalin; I think the old system is nearer to its end than you think. In the end, the interview presents a dueling version of the future of the left. Wells believed, in essence, that the Capitalist world only needed to be reformed, albeit drastically, to achieve economic justice. In spite of their differences, Wells left the interview with a positive impression of the Soviet leader. Stalin died in Following a stroke, his body remained on the floor in a pool of urine for hours before a doctor was called. His minions were terrified that he might wake up and order their execution.

Chapter 4 : Holodomor denial - Conservapedia

"MARXISM VERSUS LIBERALISM - AN INTERVIEW WITH H. G. WELLS" 23 July Source: Works, Vol. 14 Publisher: Red Star Press Ltd., London, calendrierdelascience.com

Soviet Union Initial cover-up during the famine The Soviet leadership undertook extensive efforts to prevent the spread of any information about the Holodomor. State communications about the famine were kept a top secret. Joseph Stalin and Vyacheslav Molotov sent a telegram to the party and provincial police chiefs requiring that Ukrainian peasants going north to Russia to seek bread were to be stopped. The secret correspondence included a letter sent by a party official from Dnipropetrovsk where he warned that "there will be no one left" alive to sow and ensure grain production, unless some amount of grain will not be taken. Molotov replied that the needs of the state, as "defined in party resolutions", are more important than the lives of people. Out of 9, only 3, corpses were registered in the Kyiv Medical Inspectorate. Similar cover-ups took place everywhere. It was a criminal offense to mention the famine, punishable with a five-year term in the Gulag labor camps ; placing the blame on the authorities led to a death sentence. When this became evident from the population statistics data, three successive heads of the Soviet Central Statistical Administration were executed, while others were arrested. Government officials in charge of the census received state awards immediately upon the census conclusion. When it became apparent that the final population figures were significantly lower than expected, the results were classified and the census organizers were repressed. The new census was organized in such a way as to have certainly inflated data on population numbers. It showed a population figure of No other censuses were conducted until The present hunger is temporary. In writing books you must have a longer view. It would be difficult to describe it as hunger. He asserted that the death rate in Ukraine "was the lowest of that of any of the constituent republics composing the Soviet Union," concluding that it "was about 35 percent lower than the pre-war death rate of tsarist days. The Ukrainian diaspora exerted pressure on the media and various governments, including the governments of the United States and Canada , to raise the issue of the Holodomor with the government of the Soviet Union. The United States created a Commission into the famine. The Soviet authorities predicted this commission would place the Soviet state responsible for the act. Glasnost and the late s The future President of Ukraine , Leonid Kravchuk , was charged in with finding rainfall evidence for the s famine. Ultimately, as President of Ukraine, Kravchuk would admit to the cover-up attempts, and support in recognizing the Holodomor as genocide. Duranty was the winner of the Pulitzer prize in journalism in the category of correspondence, for his dispatches on Russia and the working out of the Five Year Plan. In private however, he told Eugene Lyons and reported to the British Embassy that at least seven million had died of famine. As Duranty wrote in a dispatch from Moscow in March , "Conditions are bad, but there is no famine He also wrote denunciations of those who wrote about the famine, accusing them of being reactionaries and anti-Bolshevik propagandists. Duranty continued to repeat Soviet disinformation without verifying its veracity. As the New York Times notes: British journalist Malcolm Muggeridge characterized Duranty as "the greatest liar of any journalist I have met in 50 years of journalism. Despite the fact that the Times admits that the fraudulent coverage led to it receiving the prize, they have refused to relinquish it. Fischer traveled to Ukraine in October and November , for The Nation , and was initially alarmed at what he saw. Speaking to a college audience in Oakland, California , a week later, Fischer stated emphatically: Many people simply did not have sufficient nourishment. Government requisitions drained the countryside of food, he admitted, but military needs a potential conflict with Japan explained the need for such deadly thoroughness in grain collections. The street fight which followed saw brass knuckles, blackjacks, fists and rifle butts used until a dozen squads of police restored order. Wells , are also on record as denying the existence of the Famine in Ukraine. The testimony of Sir John Maynard, a renowned famine expert who visited the Ukraine in the summer of rejected tales of famine-genocide propagated by the Ukrainians. The day before his arrival, all beggars, homeless children and starving people were removed from the streets. Shop windows in local stores were filled with food, but purchases were forbidden, and anyone coming too close to the stores was arrested. The streets were washed.

Just like all other Western visitors, Herriot met fake "peasants," all selected Communists or Komsomol members, who showed him healthy cattle. The September 13, issue of Pravda was able to write that Herriot "categorically contradicted the lies of the bourgeoisie press in connection with a famine in the USSR. And if this was true before the war, the intellectual atmosphere is certainly no better now. Modern denial The 50th Anniversary The rallying and lobbying of the Ukrainian Diaspora Community around the 50th anniversary of the Holodomor became a concern for the governing body of the Soviet Union. Merkulov, was given the task of directing disinformation to the West and contacted Leonid Kravchuk , the chief ideolog for the Communist Party in Ukraine. In Canada , the Association of United Ukrainian Canadians a pro-Communist Labor temple Hall movement in the Ukrainian community published numerous articles denying the Holodomor in Ukraine in its English and Ukrainian language magazines and newspapers. Through its chain of bookstore outlets, it distributed pamphlets and materials whose point supplied to them from the counter-propaganda section of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. In , correspondence and instructions from Soviet sources such as the Ukraina Society to the organization regarding the Holodomor have been made available for study by scholars. The Great Famine of , which took millions of human lives. In one year - - my people lost more than throughout all of World War II, which ravaged our land. His book, published by the Communist Progress Publishers in Toronto , appeared practically at the same time Ukrainian Communist party leader Volodymyr Shcherbytsky publicly acknowledged the Holodomor, in December , and the book was subsequently withdrawn from circulation. The rest is written to discredit the work done by western Scholars, to associate the Ukrainian diaspora in the West with Fascism, and to discredit the US support of Holodomore research. Nevertheless, the book is available on the internet, and continues to be cited as an "invaluable" and "important" book by groups such as the Stalin Society in Great Britain , author Jeff Coplon , and others. But if people could be convinced that Communism is worse than fascism; that Stalin was an insane monster, even worse than Hitler; that the seven million died in more unspeakable agony than the six million One cannot appease an Evil Empire , after all. Sousa continues that Holodomor scholarship was later supported by the CIA during the Cold War specifically aimed at slandering and discrediting the Soviet government. The Stalin Society Holodomor denial continues into the 21st century with the publication of "The Ukrainian famine-genocide myth", a pamphlet penned by prominent British physician John Puntis and published in July by the Stalin Society. The Stalin Society itself has been described as "tiny, aging and schism-ridden". Tottle was invited by the commission to attend the hearings, however he ignored the request. While the commission was organized along judicial lines, it had no judicial power to compel witnesses to attend or testify. The commission president Professor Jacob Sundberg subsequently concluded that Tottle was not alone in his enterprise to deny the famine on the basis that material included in his book could not have been available to a private person without official Soviet assistance. Rather than starting from a neutral point of view, Rodsky took a revisionist version of Stalin and the history of the Soviet Union. In his third lecture in the series he approached "The Famine in Ukraine: What is the Truth? The reading list consisted exclusively of materials that denied the existence of the Holodomor. The Ukrainian Ambassador, Heorhiy Cheriavskyi , addressed the conference and spoke about the importance of international education and recognition of the Ukrainian Holodomor. Federigo Argentieri , from the Guarini Institute, read the paper: Conflicting reports on the events in highlighted the willingness of the Great Powers to ignore the plain facts witnessed by British government officials in the Soviet Union. At the time, political and economic interests took precedence over internal human rights matters. Argentieri noted that today, the famine remains virtually ignored, even in academic circles in the West. The voting figures were as follows: The Communist Party of Ukraine voted against the bill. In all, deputies supported the billâ€”a minimum of votes were required for it to be passed. The draft law envisages prosecution for public denial of the Holodomor Famine of â€” in Ukraine as a fact of genocide of the Ukrainian people, and of the Holocaust as the fact of genocide of the Jewish people. The draft law foresees that public denial as well as production and dissemination of materials denying the above shall be punished by a fine of to untaxed minimum salaries, or imprisonment of up to two years.

Chapter 5 : Herbert George Wells - Wikisource, the free online library

Joseph Stalin and H. G. Wells, Marxism VS. Liberalism: An Interview.] NOTE H. G. Wells visited the Soviet Union in and on July 23 he inter-viewed Joseph Stalin.

Joseph Stalin and H. The conversation, lasting from 4 P. The text, as printed in this pamphlet, has been approved by Mr. I am very much obliged to you, Mr. Stalin, for agreeing to see me. I was in the United States recently. I had a long conversation With President Roosevelt and tried to ascertain what his leading ideas were. Now I have come to you to ask you what you are doing to change the world. Not so very much. I wander around the world as a common man and, as a common man, observe what is going on around me. Important public men like yourself are not "common men. I am not pretending humility. What I mean is that I try to see the world through the eyes of the common man, and not as a party politician or a responsible administrator. My visit to the United States excited my mind. The old financial world is collapsing; the economic life of the country is being reorganized on new lines. Today the capitalists have to learn from you, to grasp the spirit of socialism. It seems to me that what is taking place in the United States is a profound reorganization, the creation of planned, that is, socialist, economy. You and Roosevelt begin from two different starting points. But is there not a relation in ideas, a kinship of ideas, between Washington and Moscow? In Washington I was struck by the same thing I see going on here; they are building offices, they are creating a number of new state regulation bodies, they are organizing a long-needed Civil Service. Their need, like yours, is directive ability. The United States is pursuing a different aim from that which we are pursuing in the U. The aim which the Americans are pursuing arose out of the economic troubles, out of the economic crisis. The Americans want to rid themselves of the crisis on the basis of private capitalist activity without changing the economic basis. They are trying to reduce to a minimum the ruin, the losses caused by the existing economic system. Here, however, as you know, in place of the old destroyed economic basis an entirely different, a new economic basis has been created. Even if the Americans you mention partly achieve their aim, i. They are preserving the economic system which must inevitably lead, and cannot but lead, to anarchy in production. Thus, at best, it will be a matter, not of the reorganization of society, not of abolishing the old social system which gives rise to anarchy and crises, but of restricting certain of its bad features, restricting certain of its excesses. Subjectively, perhaps, these Americans think they are reorganizing society; objectively, however, they are preserving the present basis of society. That is why, objectively, there will be no reorganization of society. Nor will there be planned economy. What is planned economy? What are some of its attributes? Planned economy tries to abolish unemployment. Let us suppose it is possible, while preserving the capitalist system, to reduce unemployment to a certain minimum. But surely, no capitalist would ever agree to the complete abolition of unemployment, to the abolition of the reserve army of unemployed, the purpose of which is to bring pressure on the labor market, to ensure a supply of cheap labor. Here you have one of the rents in the "planned economy" of bourgeois society. Furthermore, planned economy presupposes increased output in those branches of industry which produce goods that the masses of the people need particularly. But you know that the expansion of production under capitalism takes place for entirely different motives, that capital flows into those branches of economy in which the rate of profit is highest. You will never compel a capitalist to incur loss to himself and agree to a lower rate of profit for the sake of satisfying the needs of the people. Without getting rid of the capitalists, without abolishing the principle of private property in the means of production, it is impossible to create planned economy. I agree with much of what you have said. But I would like to stress the point that if a country as a whole adopts the principle of planned economy, if the government, gradually, step by step, begins consistently to apply this principle, the financial oligarchy will at last be abolished and socialism, in the Anglo-Saxon meaning of the word, will be brought about. It seems to me that instead of stressing the antagonism between the two worlds, we should, in the present circumstances, strive to establish a common tongue for all the constructive forces. In speaking of the impossibility of realizing the principles of planned economy while preserving the economic basis of capitalism I do not in the least desire to belittle the outstanding personal qualities of Roosevelt, his initiative,

courage, and determination. Undoubtedly Roosevelt stands out as one of the strongest figures among all the captains of the contemporary capitalist world. That is why I would like once again to emphasize the point that my conviction that planned economy is impossible under the conditions of capitalism does not mean that I have any doubts about the personal abilities, talent, and courage of President Roosevelt. But if the circumstances are unfavorable, the most talented captain cannot reach the goal you refer to. Theoretically, of course, the possibility of marching gradually, step by step, under the conditions of capitalism, towards the goal which you call socialism in the Anglo-Saxon meaning of the word, is not precluded. But what will this "socialism" be? At best, bridling to some extent the most unbridled of individual representatives of capitalist profit, some increase in the application of the principle of regulation in national economy. That is all very well. But as soon as Roosevelt, or any other captain in the contemporary bourgeois world, proceeds to undertake something serious against the foundation of capitalism, he will inevitably suffer utter defeat. All these are private property. We must not forget the functions of the State in the bourgeois world. The State is an institution that organizes the defense of the country, organizes the maintenance of "order"; it is an apparatus for collecting taxes. The capitalist State does not deal much with economy in the strict sense of the word; the latter is not in the hands of the State. On the contrary, the State is in the hands of capitalist economy. That is why I fear that, in spite of all his energy and abilities, Roosevelt will not achieve the goal you mention, if indeed that is his goal. Perhaps, in the course of several generations, it will be possible to approach this goal somewhat; but I personally think that even this is not very probable. Perhaps I believe more strongly in the economic interpretation of politics than you do. Huge forces driving towards better organization, for the better functioning of the community, that is, for socialism, have been brought into action by invention and modern science. Organization, and the regulation of individual action, have become mechanical necessities, irrespective of social theories. If we begin with the State control of the banks. This will be the process of socialization. Socialism and individualism are not opposites like black and white. There are many intermediate stages between them. The introduction of planned economy depends, to a large degree, upon the organizers of economy, upon the skilled technical intelligentsia, who, step by step, can be converted to the socialist principles of organization. And this is the most important thing. Because organization comes before socialism. It is the more important fact. Without organization the socialist idea is a mere idea. There is no, nor should there be, irreconcilable contrast between the individual and the collective, between the interests of the individual person and the interests of the collective, There should be no such contrast, because collectivism, socialism, does not deny, but combines individual interests with the interests of the collective. Socialism cannot abstract itself from individual interests. Socialist society alone can most fully satisfy these personal interests. More than that; socialist society alone can firmly safeguard the interests of the individual. In this sense there is no irreconcilable contrast between "individualism" and socialism. But can we deny the contrast between classes, between the propertied class, the capitalist class, and the toiling class, the proletarian class? On the one hand we have the propertied class which owns the banks, the factories, the mines, transport, the plantations in colonies. These people see nothing but their own interests, their striving after profits. They do not submit to the will of the collective; they strive to subordinate every collective to their will. On the other hand we have the class of the poor, the exploited Class, which owns neither factories nor works, nor banks, which is compelled to live by selling its labor power to the capitalists and which lacks the opportunity to satisfy its most elementary requirements. How can such opposite interests and strivings be reconciled? As far as I know, Roosevelt has not succeeded in finding the path of conciliation between these interests. And it is impossible, as experience has shown. Incidentally, you know the situation in the United States better than I do as I have never been there and I watch American affairs mainly from literature. But I have some experience in fighting for socialism and this experience tells me that if Roosevelt makes a real attempt to satisfy the interests of the proletarian class at the expense of the capitalist class, the latter will put another president in his place. The capitalists will say: Presidents come and presidents go, but we go on forever; if this or that president does not protect our interests, we shall find another. What can the president oppose to the will of the capitalist class? I object to this simplified classification of mankind into poor and rich. Of course there is a category of people which strives only for profit. But are not these people regarded as nuisances in the West just as much as

here? Are there not plenty of people in the West for whom profit is not an end, who own a certain amount of wealth, who want to invest and obtain a profit from this investment, but who do not regard this as the main object? Are there not plenty of capable and devoted engineers, organizers of industry, whose activities are stimulated by something other than profit? In my opinion there is a numerous class of capable people who admit that the present system is unsatisfactory. During the past few years I have been much engaged in and have thought of the need for conducting propaganda in favor of socialism and cosmopolitanism among wide circles of engineers, airmen, military-technical people, etc. It is useless approaching these circles with two track class war propaganda.

Chapter 6 : Joseph Stalin and H.G. Wells, Marxism VS Liberalism

The little preface says that Wells was criticized for being too 'deferential' toward Stalin (Wells was a socialist, of course). It is actually striking to me today, one can imagine NO journalist engaging in as _confrontational_ an interview with ANY politician or person in political power.

He was also an outspoken socialist. His later works become increasingly political and didactic, and only his early science fiction novels are widely read today. The family was of the impoverished lower-middle-class. An inheritance had allowed them to purchase a china shop, but the shop never provided much income. To make ends meet, Joseph sold cricket bats and balls and other equipment at matches in which he played, but this was an unsteady amount of money, since at that time there were no professional cricketers, and payment for skilled bowlers and batters came from voluntary donations after the match, or from small payments from the clubs where matches were played. To pass the time he started reading, and soon became devoted to the other worlds and lives to which books gave him access; they also stimulated his desire to write. The teaching was erratic, the curriculum mostly focused, Wells later said, on producing copperplate handwriting and doing the sort of sums useful to tradesmen. In another accident had affected his life, when his father, Joseph Wells, fractured his thigh. No longer able to support themselves financially, the family instead sought to place their boys as apprentices to various professions. From to Wells had an unhappy apprenticeship as a draper at the Southsea Drapery Emporium. The young man was reportedly not displeased with this ending to his apprenticeship. Later that year, he became an assistant teacher at Midhurst Grammar School, in West Sussex, until he won a scholarship to the Normal School of Science in London, studying biology under T. As an alumnus, he later helped to set up the Royal College of Science Association, of which he became the first president in Wells studied in his new school until with an allowance of 21 shillings a week thanks to his scholarship. He soon entered the Debating Society of the school. These years mark the beginning of his interest in a possible reformation of society. At first approaching the subject through studying *The Republic* by Plato, he soon turned to contemporary ideas of socialism as expressed by the recently-formed Fabian Society dedicated to socialism, and free lectures delivered at Kelmscott House, the home of William Morris. He was also among the founders of *The Science School Journal*, a school magazine that allowed him to express his views on literature and society. The school year was the last year of his studies. Having previously successfully passed his exams in both biology and physics, his lack of interest in geology resulted in his failure to pass and the loss of his scholarship. In Wells married his cousin Isabel Mary Wells, who divorced him when she discovered the nature of his affair with one of his students, Amy Catherine Robbins, whom he married in He had two sons by Amy: George Philip in and Frank Richard in When originally serialized in a magazine it was subtitled, "An Experiment in Prophecy," and it is still considered his most explicitly futuristic work. Anticipating what the world would be like in the year, the book is interesting both for its accurate predictions – trains and cars resulting in the dispersion of population; moral restrictions declining as men and women seek greater sexual liberation; the defeat of German militarism, and the existence of a European Union – as well as for its less-than-accurate musings. Wells called his early novels, "scientific romances," inventing a number of themes now classic in science fiction in such works as *The Time Machine*, *The Invisible Man*, and *The War of the Worlds*. He also wrote other, non-fantastic novels which have received critical acclaim, including the satire on Edwardian advertising *Tono-Bungay* and *Kipps*. Though *Tono-Bungay* was not a science-fiction novel, radioactive decay plays a small but consequential role in it. Radioactive decay plays a much larger role in *The World Set Free* Although the rate of release is too slow to have practical utility, the total amount of energy released by the decay of radium is huge. *The World Set Free* revolves around an unspecified invention that accelerates the process of radioactive decay, producing bombs that explode with no more than the force of ordinary high explosive – but which "continue to explode" for days on end. Wells also wrote nonfiction. His bestselling two-volume work, *The Outline of History*, began a new era of popularized world history. It received a mixed critical response from professional historians, but was praised by Arnold J. Toynbee as the best introductory history available. Political efforts Wells called his political views socialist, but he

occasionally found himself at odds with other socialists. He was for a time a member of the left-of-center Fabian Society associated with the Labour Party, but who "broke with the Fabians in on the issue of mass agitation or rather lack of it. He became a staunch critic of their grasp of economics and educational reform. He also ran as a Labour Party candidate for London University in and , but even at that point his faith in that party was flagging. His most consistent political ideal was the concept of the World State. He stated in his autobiography that from onward he considered a world-state inevitable. The details of this state varied but in general it would be a planned society that would advance science, end nationalism, and allow people to advance solely by merit rather than birth. While supporting a meritocracy, he viewed parliamentary democracy as an insufficient foundation for a world-state. Wells remained fairly consistent in his rejection of parliamentary democracy as a basis for a world-state, opposing any mention of democracy during his work on the United Nations Charter. He feared that the average citizen could never be educated or aware enough to decide the major issues of the world. Therefore he favored the vote be limited to scientists, organizers, engineers, and others of merit. At the same time he strongly believed citizens should have as much freedom as they could without consequently restricting the freedom of others. These values came under increasing criticism from the s and afterwards.

Chapter 7 : Full text of "Man and Plan in Soviet Economy"

When H.G. Wells published an interview with Stalin in the New Statesman in a controversy resulted, and two other leading intellectuals of the day-George Bernard Shaw and John Maynard Keynes-were invited to respond in a subsequent issue of the journal.

Red Star Press Ltd. Marxists Internet Archive You may freely copy, distribute, display and perform this work; as well as make derivative and commercial works. Please credit "Marxists Internet Archive" as your source. I am very much obliged to you, Mr. Stalin, for agreeing to see me. I was in the United States recently. I had a long conversation with President Roosevelt and tried to ascertain what his leading ideas were. Now I have come to ask you what you are doing to change the world. Not so very much. I wander around the world as a common man and, as a common man, observe what is going on around me. Important public men like yourself are not "common men". Of course, history alone can show how important this or that public man has been; at all events, you do not look at the world as a "common man. I am not pretending humility. What I mean is that I try to see the world through the eyes of the common man, and not as a party politician or a responsible administrator. My visit to the United States excited my mind. The old financial world is collapsing; the economic life of the country is being reorganized on new lines. It seems to me that what is taking place in the United States is a profound reorganisation, the creation of planned, that is, socialist, economy. You and Roosevelt begin from two different starting points. But is there not a relation in ideas, a kinship of ideas, between Moscow and Washington? In Washington I was struck by the same thing I see going on here; they are building offices, they are creating a number of state regulation bodies, they are organising a long-needed Civil Service. Their need, like yours, is directive ability. The United States is pursuing a different aim from that which we are pursuing in the U. The aim which the Americans are pursuing, arose out of the economic troubles, out of the economic crisis. The Americans want to rid themselves of the crisis on the basis of private capitalist activity, without changing the economic basis. They are trying to reduce to a minimum the ruin, the losses caused by the existing economic system. Here, however, as you know, in place of the old, destroyed economic basis, an entirely different, a new economic basis has been created. Even if the Americans you mention partly achieve their aim, i. They are preserving the economic system which must inevitably lead, and cannot but lead, to anarchy in production. Thus, at best, it will be a matter, not of the reorganisation of society, not of abolishing the old social system which gives rise to anarchy and crises, but of restricting certain of its excesses. Subjectively, perhaps, these Americans think they are reorganising society; objectively, however, they are preserving the present basis of society. That is why, objectively, there will be no reorganisation of society. Nor will there be planned economy. What is planned economy? What are some of its attributes? Planned economy tries to abolish unemployment. Let us suppose it is possible, while preserving the capitalist system, to reduce unemployment to a certain minimum. But surely, no capitalist would ever agree to the complete abolition of unemployment, to the abolition of the reserve army of unemployed, the purpose of which is to bring pressure on the labour market, to ensure a supply of cheap labour. Here you have one of the rents in the "planned economy" of bourgeois society. Furthermore, planned economy presupposes increased output in those branches of industry which produce goods that the masses of the people need particularly. But you know that the expansion of production under capitalism takes place for entirely different motives, that capital flows into those branches of economy in which the rate of profit is highest. You will never compel a capitalist to incur loss to himself and agree to a lower rate of profit for the sake of satisfying the needs of the people. Without getting rid of the capitalists, without abolishing the principle of private property in the means of production, it is impossible to create planned economy. I agree with much of what you have said. But I would like to stress the point that if a country as a whole adopts the principle of planned economy, if the government, gradually, step by step, begins consistently to apply this principle, the financial oligarchy will at last be abolished and socialism, in the Anglo-Saxon meaning of the word, will be brought about. It seems to me that instead of stressing the antagonism between the two worlds, we should, in the present circumstances, strive to establish a common tongue for all the constructive forces. In speaking of the impossibility of realising

the principles of planned economy while preserving the economic basis of capitalism, I do not in the least desire to belittle the outstanding personal qualities of Roosevelt, his initiative, courage and determination. Undoubtedly, Roosevelt stands out as one of the strongest figures among all the captains of the contemporary capitalist world. That is why I would like, once again, to emphasize the point that my conviction that planned economy is impossible under the conditions of capitalism, does not mean that I have any doubts about the personal abilities, talent and courage of President Roosevelt. But if the circumstances are unfavourable, the most talented captain cannot reach the goal you refer to. Theoretically, of course, the possibility of marching gradually, step by step, under the conditions of capitalism, towards the goal which you call socialism in the Anglo-Saxon meaning of the word, is not precluded. But what will this "socialism" be? At best, bridling to some extent, the most unbridled of individual representatives of capitalist profit, some increase in the application of the principle of regulation in national economy. That is all very well. But as soon as Roosevelt, or any other captain in the contemporary bourgeois world, proceeds to undertake something serious against the foundation of capitalism, he will inevitably suffer utter defeat. All these are private property. The railroads, the mercantile fleet, all these belong to private owners. We must not forget the functions of the State in the bourgeois world. The State is an institution that organises the defence of the country, organises the maintenance of "order"; it is an apparatus for collecting taxes. The capitalist State does not deal much with economy in the strict sense of the word; the latter is not in the hands of the State. On the contrary, the State is in the hands of capitalist economy. That is why I fear that in spite of all his energies and abilities, Roosevelt will not achieve the goal you mention, if indeed that is his goal. Perhaps, in the course of several generations it will be possible to approach this goal somewhat; but I personally think that even this is not very probable. Perhaps, I believe more strongly in the economic interpretation of politics than you do. Huge forces driving towards better organisation, for the better functioning of the community, that is, for socialism, have been brought into action by invention and modern science. Organisation, and the regulation of individual action, have become mechanical necessities, irrespective of social theories. If we begin with the State control of the banks and then follow with the control of transport, of the heavy industries of industry in general, of commerce, etc. This will be the process of socialisation. Socialism and individualism are not opposites like black and white. There are many intermediate stages between them. There is individualism that borders on brigandage, and there is discipline and organisation that are the equivalent of socialism. The introduction of planned economy depends, to a large degree, upon the organisers of economy, upon the skilled technical intelligentsia, who, step by step, can be converted to the socialist principles of organisation. And this is the most important thing. Because organisation comes before socialism. It is the more important fact. Without organisation the socialist idea is a mere idea. There is no, nor should there be, irreconcilable contrast between the individual and the collective, between the interests of the individual person and the interests of the collective. There should be no such contrast, because collectivism, socialism, does not deny, but combines individual interests with the interests of the collective. Socialism cannot abstract itself from individual interests. Socialist society alone can most fully satisfy these personal interests. More than that; socialist society alone can firmly safeguard the interests of the individual. In this sense there is no irreconcilable contrast between "individualism" and socialism. But can we deny the contrast between classes, between the propertied class, the capitalist class, and the toiling class, the proletarian class? On the one hand we have the propertied class which owns the banks, the factories, the mines, transport, the plantations in colonies. These people see nothing but their own interests, their striving after profits. They do not submit to the will of the collective; they strive to subordinate every collective to their will. On the other hand we have the class of the poor, the exploited class, which owns neither factories nor works, nor banks, which is compelled to live by selling its labour power to the capitalists which lacks the opportunity to satisfy its most elementary requirements. How can such opposite interests and strivings be reconciled? As far as I know, Roosevelt has not succeeded in finding the path of conciliation between these interests. And it is impossible, as experience has shown. Incidentally, you know the situation in the United States better than I do as I have never been there and I watch American affairs mainly from literature. But I have some experience in fighting for socialism, and this experience tells me that if Roosevelt makes a real attempt to satisfy the interests of the proletarian class at

the expense of the capitalist class, the latter will put another president in his place. The capitalists will say: Presidents come and presidents go, but we go on forever; if this or that president does not protect our interests, we shall find another. What can the president oppose to the will of the capitalist class? I object to this simplified classification of mankind into poor and rich. Of course there is a category of people which strive only for profit. But are not these people regarded as nuisances in the West just as much as here? Are there not plenty of people in the West for whom profit is not an end, who own a certain amount of wealth, who want to invest and obtain a profit from this investment, but who do not regard this as the main object?

Chapter 8 : Joseph Stalin | Biography, World War II, & Facts | calendrierdelascience.com

~ Joseph Stalin Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin (born Iosif Vissarionovich Dzhugashvili; December 18, - March 5,) was the first General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union's Central Committee from until his death in

Death is the solution to all problems. He led the Soviet Union through a period of rapid growth and industrialization, and led it through World War II in which the Red Army was victorious over Nazi Germany and captured Berlin in , ending the war in Europe. He was born into a poor family, two of his siblings died in infancy prior to his birth. His father Besarion was an alcoholic and beat his wife named Keke and Joseph. He later changed his surname to "Stalin", meaning "Man of Steel" in Russian. It was that this time that he joined the Bolshevik party. The party needed money and the young Stalin started doing bank heists to earn money for the party. Between and , he got arrested eight times. After the war, communist governments gained power in eastern Europe and in other countries like China, thus causing him, as the leader of the most influential socialist state, to be branded a villain by the Western world and sparking the Cold War. As Leader of the Soviet Union Lenin was hesitant to the idea that Stalin would succeed him, and wrote sometime before his death "Comrade Stalin is unfit for leadership, he is too rude and undereducated. Stalin however recriminalised homosexuality in , as well as abortion. This was possibly due to him wanting a larger population of the Soviet Union. However, lesbian activity was still legal throughout his period. Stalin died in His successor, Nikita Khrushchev, then began the capitalistic Soviet policy that continued into the s and led to its collapse. Death His health began slowly declining in the s. In , he suffered a heart attack which he put down to his lifelong heavy smoking. He died from a stroke on March 5, at the age of Many in the west were sceptical if his death was faked, which lead to his corpse being publicly displayed at his state funeral four days later. He remains very popular; popular opinion within the Russian Federation is mixed. Fewer than a third of all Russians regarded Stalin as a "murderous tyrant". Half of the respondents, aged from 16 to 19, agreed Stalin was a wise leader. In his home country of Georgia, that number rises to 68 percent. Stalin had a better relationship with his mother than his father. However, his daughter, Svetlana Alliluyeva, claims the only person her father had any fear of was his mother. This could be attributed to his strict upbringing, his mother was a pious and raised him devout in the Russian Orthodox Church. At one point in fact, she was hoping for him to train as a priest in the church. In the Tsarist Russian Empire, Stalin, along with other future members of the party, would rob bourgeois banks to donate to the Communist Party prior to the Revolution. When being interviewed by HG Wells in , Stalin explained his communist ideologies in detail. In the interview, he explained the faults of capitalism, stating "There is much we Bolsheviks can learn from the capitalist".

Chapter 9 : British Intellectuals Visit Moscow

Joseph Stalin: Joseph Stalin, secretary-general of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union () and premier of the Soviet state (), who for a quarter of a century dictatorially ruled the Soviet Union and transformed it into a major world power.