

5403

Page 64.

"What, for instance, was one to make of the claim in the same book that the Soviet nationalities policy had been a total success, and that the disappearance of any sign of opposition to the regime on the part of the non-Russian nationalities was so complete that it could not just be a matter of suppression."

Page 64.

"Douglas, like so many more of us (his wife writes), saw in Soviet Russia the negation of the immoralities of industrial capitalism and the system of private profit, and was eager to follow the gleam without seeking to imitate in detail."

Page 66.

"It was easy enough to believe that opposition to Stalin must have been treacherous in intent when one also believed that agricultural collectivisation had been thoroughly digested by the 1930s and that the Russian masses had happily settled down to enjoy the "new civilisation."

Footnotes:-

Socialist Thought, Vol. V (1960), p. 253.

Page 66

An Oxford ditty (variously attributed to Maurice Reckitt or W.N. Ever) ran

"G.D.H. Cole is a bit of a puzzle;

a Bolshevik soul in a Fabian muzzle."

Page 66.

"For Cole, writing towards the end of his life, Stalin had been someone " in pursuit of a world-wide revolt of the exploited and repressed which ranged the Soviet Union basically on the right side in world affairs, despite all the malpractices involved in pursuing it." Why, then, were the malpractices (so far as they were admitted to be) condoned?"

Page 66 (contd.)

Two reasons emerge as one looks again at Cole's writings in the light of his wife's account of the man.

The first of these sprang from a combination of ignorance and of that kind of insularity which neither expects other countries to enjoy the advantages of one's own, nor feels sympathy for their peoples if they do not."

Page 66.

The second reason is to be found precisely in Cole's dedication to ~~abstina-~~^{ra} tions. At some point early in his adult life he decided that the root of all evil was an economic system based upon private profit and hence-forward his political views were of a Manichean simplicity: Socialism, good - Capitalism, bad. Therefore any regime which could present itself as "socialist" because it had eliminated Capitalism was without further investigation superior to one in ~~which~~ which private profit still played an important ~~part~~ role. Eventually the evidence of Soviet oppressiveness was too much even for Cole:

"It cost him (writes Margaret Cole) a good deal of mental suffering towards the end of his life to admit that "democratic centralism" and Stalinism in Russia had produced horrors which outweighed the advantages of their having abolished private profit. Even then he was apt to maintain that the Americans, who had retained private profit, were much worse."

Page 67.

"Margaret Cole can quote a survey of members of the Parliamentary Labour Party at the time of his death which revealed that among writers its members claimed to have been influenced by, Cole came third - after Shaw and H.G. Wells, and above Karl Marx."

Footnote:

New Society, 18 December 1962. It is interesting that Cole was found to be more influential ~~xxx~~ than R.H. Tawney, a much nobler man, and than Harold Laski, a much abler and more earned man. Cole, not surprisingly, hated Laski.

Page 64.

"what, for instance, was one to make of the claim in the same book that the Soviet nationalities policy had been a total success, and that the disappearance of any sign of opposition to the regime on the part of the non-Russian nationalities was so complete that it could not just be a matter of suppression."

Page 64.

"Douglas, like so many more of us (his wife writes), saw in Soviet Russia the negation of the immoralities of industrial capitalism and the system of private profit, and was eager to follow the gleam without seeking to imitate in detail."

Page 66.

"It was easy enough to believe that opposition to Stalin must have been treacherous in intent when one also believed that agricultural collectivisation had been thoroughly digested by the 1930s and that the Russian masses had happily settled down to enjoy the "new civilisation."

Footnotes:-

Socialist Thought, Vol. V (1960), p. 253.

Page 66x

An Oxford ditty (variously attributed to Maurice Reckitt or W.H. Ewer) ran

"G.D.H. Cole is a bit of a puzzle;

a Bolshevik soul in a Fabian muzzle."

Page 66.

"For Cole, writing towards the end of his life, Stalin had been someone " in pursuit of a world-wide revolt of the exploited and repressed which ranged the Soviet Union basically on the right side in world affairs, despite all the malpractices involved in pursuing it." Why, then, were the malpractices (so far as they were admitted to be) condoned?"

Page 66 (contd.)

Two reasons emerge as one looks again at Cole's writings in the light of his wife's account of the man.

The first of these sprang from a combination of ignorance and of that kind of insularity which neither expects other countries to enjoy the advantages of one's own, nor feels sympathy for their peoples if they do not."

Page 66.

The second reason is to be found precisely in Cole's dedication to ~~abstra~~^{abstr}ctions. At some point early in his adult life he decided that the root of all evil was an economic system based upon private profit and hence-forward his political views were of a Manichean simplicity: Socialism, good - Capitalism, bad. Therefore any regime which could present itself as "socialist" because it had eliminated Capitalism was without further investigation superior to one in ~~which~~ which private profit still played an important ~~part~~ role. Eventually the evidence of Soviet oppressiveness was too much even for Cole:

"It cost him (writes Margaret Cole) a good deal of mental suffering towards the end of his life to admit that "democratic centralism" and Stalinism in Russia had produced horrors which outweighed the advantages of their having abolished private profit. Even then he was apt to maintain that the Americans, who had retained private profit, were much worse."

Page 67.

"Margaret Cole can quote a survey of members of the Parliamentary Labour Party at the time of his death which revealed that among writers its members claimed to have been influenced by, Cole came third - after Shaw and H.G. Wells, and above Karl Marx."

Footnote:

New Society, 18 December 1962. It is interesting that Cole was found to be more influential ~~xxx~~ than R.H. Tawney, a much nobler man, and than Harold Laski, a much abler and more earned man. Cole, not surprisingly, hated Laski.

Page 64. "What, for instance, was one to make of the claim in the same book that the Soviet nationalities policy had been a total success, and that the disappearance of any sign of opposition to the regime on the part of the non-Russian nationalities was so complete that it could not just be a matter of suppression."

Page 64. "Douglas, like so many more of us (his wife writes), saw in Soviet Russia the negation of the immoralities of industrial capitalism and the system of private profit, and was eager to follow the gleam without seeking to imitate in detail."

Page 66. "It was easy enough to believe that opposition to Stalin must have been treacherous in intent when one also believed that agricultural collectivisation had been thoroughly digested by the 1930s and that the Russian masses had happily settled down to enjoy the "new civilisation."

Footnotes:-

Socialist Thought, Vol. V (1960), p. 253.

Page 66. An Oxford ditty (variously attributed to Maurice Reckitt or W.H. Ever) ran
"G.D.H. Cole is a bit of a puzzle;
a Bolshevik soul in a Fabian muzzle."

Page 66. "For Cole, writing towards the end of his life, Stalin had been someone " in pursuit of a world-wide revolt of the exploited and repressed which ranged the Soviet Union basically on the right side in world affairs, despite all the malpractices involved in pursuing it." Why, then, were the malpractices (so far as they were admitted to be) condoned?"

Two reasons emerge as one looks again at Cole's writings in the light of his wife's account of the man.

The first of these sprang from a combination of ignorance and of that kind of insularity which neither expects other countries to enjoy the advantages of one's own, nor feels sympathy for their peoples if they do not."

The second reason is to be found precisely in Cole's dedication to abstin^{en}ce. At some point early in his adult life he decided that the root of all Evil was an economic system based upon private profit and hence-forward his political views were of a Manichaean simplicity: Socialism, good - Capitalism, bad. Therefore any regime which could present itself as "socialist" because it had eliminated Capitalism was without further investigation superior to one in which private profit still played an important ~~part~~ role. Eventually the evidence of Soviet oppressiveness was too much even for Cole:

"It cost him (writes Margaret Cole) a good deal of mental suffering towards the end of his life to admit that "democratic centralism" and Stalinism in Russia had produced horrors which outweighed the advantages of their having abolished private profit. Even then he was apt to maintain that the Americans, who had retained private profit, were much worse."

"Margaret Cole can quote a survey of members of the Parliamentary Labour Party at the time of his death which revealed that among writers its members claimed to have been influenced by, Cole came third - after Shaw and H.G. Wells, and above Karl Marx."

Footnote:

New Society, 18 December 1962. It is interesting that Cole was found to be more influential ~~xxx~~ than R.H. Tawney, a much nobler man, and than Harold Laski, a much abler and more earnest man. Cole, not surprisingly, hated Laski.